289.6
P38d

THE UNIVERSITY

OF ILLINOIS

LIBRARY

X 289.6
P38d

ILLINOIS HISTORICAL SURVEY

A

DEFENCE

Of a PAPER, Entituled,

Gospel-Truths,

Against the

EXCEPTIONS

OF THE

Bishop of *Cork's* Testimony.

By W. Penn.

London, Printed and Sold by *T. Sowle*, in *White-Hart-Court*, in *Gracious-Street*, and at the *Bible* in *Leaden-Hall-Street*, 1698.

182.6
P32d

THE PREFACE.

Reader,

IT *was the Wise Counsel of an Ancient and Great Prelate, of the Kingdom of* Ireland, *at a late Visit I made him there, to discourage Controversie, and endeavour to abate Strife among Christians: For, said he,* Heaven is a Quiet Place; there are no Quarrels there, and Religion is a Holy and Peaceable Thing, and Excites to Piety and Charity, and not to Genealogies, Strife and Debates. *But the Bishop of* Cork *seems to be of another Mind, that could not pass by so Inoffensive a Paper as that stiled* Gospel-Truths (*given him by me in a*

404875

Private

Private Way, at a Friendly Visit upon his own Desire) without his Publick Animadversions; *and those expresst not with so much* Justice *and* Charity *as might have been expected from him to his Dissenting Neighbours.*

I am, I confess, very sorry my Christian Visits to the Bishop have met with no better returns than Controversie: But because that's his, and not my fault, it shall be my Satisfaction.

I did indeed, Perceiving him Conversant in our Writings, and his Character to be Moderation, casually Present him with one of those Papers; but as the Nature of it is Far from Provocation, so my design in it was purely to Improve *his Temper, and not to* Excite *his Contradiction. Nor was it Writ for*

an

an Exact *and Compleat Account of our Belief, but* Occasionally, *to prevent the Prejudices that the Attempts of a Course and Scurrilous Pen at* Dublin, *just before, might provoke in some against us, as to the Points touched upon in the* Gospel-Truths. *And though we have been so Unhappy as to be therein Mistaken by the Bishop, yet it's some Comfort to us that our Christian Declaration hath had quite another Reception with the Generality of those to whose Hands it has come: And I heartily wish That hath not been the most prevailing Motive to his Undertaking. However, since he has been pleased to fault it both with* Shortness *and* Error, *which we thought Healing, at least Inoffensive, I esteem my self Answerable for it,*

and

and shall, with God's Assistance, Defend it against the Force of his Exceptions, *and I hope with* Clearness *and* Temper: *For, though I may be plain, as he must expect, I desire to be neither* Rude *nor* Bitter.

I ask, Reader, *but the Common Justice due to all Authors, especially in Controvered Points of Religion, to wit,* Attention *and* Impartiality; *and then judge whether our* Pacifick *Paper deserved so* Sharp *a Censure, and the Manner of its being given him, so* Publick *a Return: Though I hope the Consequence will be Good. To Almighty God I leave the Success, and am in all Christian Obligation,*

Thy Assured Friend,

Bristol, the 23d of the 7th Month, 1698.

W. Penn.

THE

THE TESTIMONY OF THE Bishop of *Cork*;

As to a PAPER, Intituled *Gospel-Truths held*, &c. *by the People called* **Quakers**. And delivered to Him by an Eminent Member of them.

[*The PAPER was as follows.*]

Sober Reader,

IF *thou hadst rather we should be in the Right than in the Wrong, and if thou thinkest it but a reasonable thing that we should be Heard before we are* Condemned, *and that our Belief ought to be taken from our* own Mouths, *and not at theirs that have prejudged our Cause, then we intreat thee to* Read *and* Weigh *the following Brief Account of those Things that are chiefly Received and Professed among us the People called* Quakers, *according to the Testimony of the Scriptures of Truth, and the Illumination of the Holy Ghost, which are the*

Double and Agreeing Record of true Religion. Published to Inform the Moderate Enquirer, and Reclaim the Prejudiced to a better Temper; which GOD *grant, to his Glory, and their Peace.*

I. It is our Belief, That GOD is, and that He is a Rewarder of all them that *fear* Him, with Eternal Rewards of *Happiness*; and that those that *fear* Him not, *shall be turned into Hell*, Heb. 11. 16. Rev. 22. 12. Rom. 2. 5, 6, 7, 8. Psal. 9. 17.

II. That there are *Three* that bear Record in Heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Spirit; and these *Three* are really *One*, 1 *John* 5. 7.

III. That the Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among *Men*, and was and is the *only Begotten* of the Father, full of *Grace* and *Truth*; his beloved Son, in whom he is *well pleased*, and whom we are to hear *in all things*; *who tasted Death for every Man*, and died for Sin, that *we might die to Sin*, and by his Power and Spirit be raised up to Newness of Life here, and to Glory hereafter, *John.* 1. 14. *Matth.* 3. 17. *Heb.* 2. 9.

IV. That as we are *only justified* from the *Guilt* of Sin by Christ the *Propitiation*, and not by Works of Righteousness that we have done; so there is an absolute Necessity that we receive and obey, to *unfeigned Repentance and Amendment of Life*, the Holy Light and Spirit of *Jesus Christ*, in order to obtain that Re-

Remiſſion and Juſtification from Sin: Since no Man can be juſtified by *Chriſt*, *who walks not after the Spirit, but after the Fleſh; for whom he ſanctifies, them he alſo juſtifies: And if we walk in the Light, as he is Light, his precious Blood cleanſeth us from all Sin; as well from the pollution as Guilt of Sin*, Rom. 3. 22. to 26. Chap. 8. 1, 2, 3, 4. 1 John 5. 7.

V. That Chriſt is the Great *Light of the World*, that lighteth *every Man* that cometh into the World, and is *full* of Grace and Truth, and giveth to all, Light for Light, and Grace for Grace; and by his Light and Grace he Inwardly Appears to Man, and teaches ſuch as will be taught by him, *That denying ungodlineſs and worldly Luſts, they ſhould live Soberly, Righteouſly, and Godly in this preſent World*, John 8. 12. Chap. 1. 9, 14. Tit. 2. 11, 12.

VI. That this Principle of Light and Grace, which is God's Gift, through Chriſt to Man, is that which *ſhews* us our Sins, *reproves* us for them, and would *lead all out of them* that *obey* it, to ſerve GOD, in *Fear* and *Love*, all their *Days*. And *they* that turn not at the Reproofs thereof, and will not repent, and live, and walk according to it, *ſhall die in their Sins; and where Chriſt is gone, they ſhall never come, who is undefiled, and ſeparated from Sinners*, Epheſ. 5. 13. John 16. 7. Prov. 1. 20, to 24. John 8. 24.

VII. This is that Principle by which GOD prepares the Heart to worſhip him aright, and all the Duties of Religion, as *Praying*, *Praiſing* and *Preaching*, ought to be performed through the ſanctifying Power and Aſſiſtance of it; other Worſhip being but *Formal* and *Will-Worſhip*, with which we cannot, in Conſcience, Join, nor can we *maintain* or *uphold it*, Rom. 8. 26. 1 Pet. 4. 10, 11.

VIII. Worſhip in this *Goſpel-Day* is Inward and Spiritual: For, *God is a Spirit*, as Chriſt teacheth, and he will *Now* be worſhipped in *Spirit* and *Truth*, being moſt ſuitable to his Divine Nature. Wherefore we wait in our Aſſemblies to feel GOD's Spirit to open and move upon our Hearts, before we dare offer Sacrifice to the LORD, or Preach to others the way of his Kingdom. That we may Preach in *Power* as well as *Words*, and as GOD Promiſed, and Chriſt Ordained, *without Money, and without Price*, John 4. 23, 24. 1 Theſſ. 1. 5. Iſa. 55. 1. Rev. 22. 17. Mat. 10. 8.

IX. This alſo leads us *to* deny all the vain Cuſtoms and Faſhions of the World, to avoid Exceſs in all things, that our Moderation may be ſeen of all Men, becauſe the LORD is at hand, to See and Judge us according to our Deeds, *Tit.* 2. 12. *Rom.* 12. 2. *Phil.* 4. 5. *Eccl.* 12. 14. *Matth.* 16. 27. *Rom.* 2. 6. *Rev.* 20. 12.

X. We

X. We believe the neceſſity of the *One Baptiſm* Chriſt; as well as of his *One Supper*, which he promiſeth to Eat with thoſe that open the Door of their Hearts to him, being the Baptiſm and Supper ſignified by the Outward Signs; which, tho we diſ-uſe, we Judge not thoſe that conſcientiouſly practice them, *Matth.* 3. 11. *Ephſ.* 4. 1. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21, 22. *John* 6. *Rev.* 3. 20.

XI. We *Honour Government*; for we believe it is an Ordinance of God; and that we ought in all things to ſubmit, by Doing or Suffering; but eſteem it a great *Bleſſing*, where the Adminiſtration is a *Terror to evil doers, and a Praiſe to them that do well*, Rom. 13. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

This hath all along been the general Stream and Tendency both of our Miniſtry and Writings, as our Books will make appear, notwithſtanding what Ill-minded and Prejudic'd Perſons may have ſtrained to Miſ-repreſent Us and our Chriſtian Profeſſion.

Dublin, 4*th of the* 3*d Month*, 1698.

William Penn,
Anthony Sharp,
Tho. Story,
George Rook.

Friends,

I Am such a *Reader* as in your Paper you desire. I have *read* and *Soberly weighed the Account* you give of *those thing*, *which you say are chiefly Received and Professed amongst you.* And I will exercise so much Moderation and Charity, as to lay a great weight on that word [*chiefly*] hoping these are not the Only Things, or All that you Believe. I should have been heartily glad to have found that you had been in the Truth, as I am well assured I my self am; but, as *I professed*, when the Paper was given me, That if I took it, you must expect I should *bear my Testimony touching It or against It*: So I now must tell you, I think my self bound in Conscience to perform what I then professed; and that upon more Reasons than I will now trouble the World with. You must not be offended if I say, You have such a way of Writing and Speaking, that it is very hard in many matters of Religion to know what you mean. But, as far as I understand you, I will candidly acknowledge what Truths you have sufficiently or tolerably exprest, I will shew you, with Meekness, *how far your Faith*, if this be your Faith, comes short of being sufficient or *Christian*; and I will sincerely tell you, what I apprehend to be the *cause of your*

De-

Deluſion, and how *dangerous a Condition* I really fear, nay believe, you to be in.

And firſt; The only Articles, in which you have expreſt a ſufficient Chriſtian Belief, are your VI. which is touching Juſtification, and your laſt touching Government and your Submiſſion thereto. I wiſh you may always ſtick to this Belief and Practice; and I heartily rejoyce to find you acknowledging the *Neceſſity of Chriſt, as a Propitiation, in order to Remiſſion of Sins and Juſtifying you*, as Sinners, *from Guilt*. 'Tis the firſt time I have heard of it amongſt you.

As to all the reſt of your Articles, I mean thoſe which I underſtand, I muſt tell you, the Declaration of your Faith comes ſo ſhort of what is required from People to denominate them Chriſtians, that except, under each Article, you believe more than you have declar'd, you cannot be accounted Chriſtians. For firſt, in thoſe Articles of Faith, which you have thought fit to mention, you have ſet down only ſome little Ends, I had almoſt called them Snaps, of the Article. And Secondly, Many more whole Articles, of the true Chriſtian Faith, aud which are of no leſs import, you have intirely omitted, waved or ſuppreſſed.

You acknowledge in your I. Article, *there is a God*, and you own his Providence as to the other Life. But that *He made Heaven*

and Earth, that He is the *Almighty*, and at preſent by his Sovereign Power moſt wiſely and holily, Governs, Orders, and Suſtains all (by his Mercies as well as Judgments, even in this World, *not leaving himſelf without witneſs*) you ſay not a word. *Creation* in the beginning and *Providence* as to this World at preſent, are not here acknowledged by you. We hope you believe both.

Your II. Article is wholly true; for it is expreſs Scripture, *1 John* 5. 7. But it is only what the Apoſtle there had occaſion to ſay, and what was to his purpoſe, touching the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*; far from being the Sum of what the Holy Scripture teaches of them; and therefore is not a ſufficient Confeſſion of Faith on that Head.

In your III. Article you acknowledge indeed the *Son of God to have been made Fleſh*, but neither *Conceived by the Holy Ghoſt*, *nor Born of the Virgin* Mary; ſo that it does not appear, by this your Confeſſion, but that He was at firſt an ordinary corrupt Sinful Perſon; Nay, you own him not ſo much as *Jeſus* or the *Chriſt*; (the great *Saviour*, who delivereth from the Wrath which is to come; or the Great *Prophet*, *Prieſt*, *Lord* and *King*, of his Church:) You acknowledge him indeed to have *dyed for Sin*, but (not to mention the Articles inferrible from, and relating to, the Circumſtances of his Death.) You have not

one

one word of *His Resurrection* from the Dead, *or of His Ascention into Heaven*; which it may be proved some of you have expresly denied, saying, *He is not Ascended into Heaven, He is in us.* Nor again, *of His sitting now at the right hand of the Majesty on high.* And so you seem not to own any thing of His *Mediation, Intercession, or Appearing now in Heaven for us.* Nor further have you said a word of his *Coming again to Judgment, or the End of the World.* Thus indeed You have here neither owned the *Creation or Dissolution* of the World; so that it does not appear, by this Account of your Faith, whether you do not Judge it Eternal, and so otherwise Infinite, Yet again, Not a word of *One Church*, which it may be feared you strike out of your Belief, because you are resolved never more to return into the Unity of the Church, but to make and maintain a Schism or Party for ever. Nor further, have you a word of the *Resurrection of the Body*, which divers of you have been known to deny, and others of you only say, *It may be so.* And Lastly, Tho you acknowledge Everlasting Rewards for them that fear *God*, yet nothing of the *Everlasting Punishment of Wicked Men:* You mention *Hell* indeed (in a very unnatural place, *viz.* in your first Article of the Being of *God*) but whether you mean thereby the *Grave*, as most commonly in Scripture is meant; or a *place o*

Temporal Punishment after this Life, as some have done; *or a State of total Destruction and Annihilation*, as many now a-days do, no one knows.

Upon the whole; As to the Sum of the Christian Faith, which you have been pleased to set down, There is not one Article of our common Twelve, that you have owned intirely; and Eight at least, if not more of them, that you have here totally suppressed or waved. And how influential to a holy Life, those which you have waved are, and therefore how necessary to Salvation, I must require and conjure you, on your own Eternal Account, to consider. I will only mind you of two passages out of the Scriptures of Truth: 1 *Cor.* 15. 16, 17. *If the Dead rise not* (that is, if there be no Resurrection of the Flesh) *then is not Christ raised. And if Christ is not raised, your Faith is vain, you are yet in your Sins.* Hence it appears All other Points of Faith are in vain, if this be not true. The other is *Rom.* 10.9. *If thou shalt confess with thy Mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy Heart that* GOD *hath raised him from the Dead, thou shalt be saved.* This Article alone is of such force and influence on Men's Hearts, that if believed as it should be, such belief will save Men. But both *Christ's Resurrection* and *Our own*, are by You in this Paper, left out of your Faith. I judge you not,

but

but judge Your ſelves, leſt You be condemned of the LORD.

Your V, VI, and VII. Articles treat of what you call *The Light of Chriſt within Man*: This You have never been able yet, that I could find, to make out what you mean by. For You will not allow it to be either the Natural Rational Faculty, or common innate Notions, or Natural Conſcience, or Conſcience illuminated, by the Preaching of the Goſpel, and the Operation of the Holy Ghoſt thereby: Till you can make us underſtand your meaning, or indeed till you underſtand it your ſelves (that is, till you are leſs confuſed in this, the very Fundamental Principle or Rule of what you profeſs) you muſt not think of *Declaring* (or *Publiſhing*) *an Account of your Faith*: See you underſtand it firſt. There are ſome Men who have a *Faculty* to ſpeak things *ſeemingly profound*, but in the End neither themſelves nor others can make any diſtinct ſenſe of what they have ſaid. This we uſually call *Banter*: And I muſt acknowledge as far as I can ſee, your Diſcourſe of this Light within is perfectly ſuch. Take notice, We in our Preaching require People to *look within*, as much as you do: We ſtrictly charge *all* to *walk according to the Convictions*, and *Light they have received*. We *daily appeal unto Conſcience*; but then we teach, that *Conſcience* (*opened* by the *Holy Spirit*, under the

Miniſtry

Miniſtry of the Word, *Acts* 16. 14.) does and muſt *take in its Light* from *Holy Scripture*, *The Commandment of the Lord is pure, inlightning the Eyes*, Pſalm 19. 8. (viz. of the Mind, *Eph.* 1. 18.) *Thy Word is as a Lamp to my Feet, and a Light to my Path*, Pſalm 119. 105. *To the Law and to the Teſtimony; If they* (even Men in their Conſciences) *ſpeak not according to this Word, it is becauſe there is* NO LIGHT *in them*, Iſa. 8. 20. Now theſe things are intelligible. This Rule is fixt and certain, nothing of which can be ſaid of *Your Light within.*

In Your VIII. Article You tell us, *Worſhip under the Goſpel is Inward and Spiritual.* If You mean hereby, that all Outward and Bodily Worſhip ought to be accompanied with an Inward and Spiritual Worſhip, it is what we daily Preach and Practice, and even in private preſs. But if, as it would ſeem, you mean all the Worſhip GOD now requires, is from the Inward Man, or from the Spirit, this is abominable falſe: For Our Bodies are GOD's handy-work, and Chriſt's Purchaſe, as well as Our Souls: On which reaſon, GOD, by his Apoſtle commands, *Glorifie God in your Body and in your Spirit*, [ἅτινα] *which* (in the Plural Number that is, *both which*) *are GOD's.* Not to tell you, that you your ſelves now a-days perform ſomewhat of Bodily Worſhip. And indeed, if there be not a Worſhip of the

Body

Body, as well as of the Spirit, there can be no publick Worſhip. This Article therefore muſt alſo be mended, to make it Chriſtian.

In your IX. Article, You tell us of your *Denying all the vain Cuſtoms and Faſhions of the World, as alſo Exceſs in all things.* I know no ſort of Chriſtians who teach otherwiſe; I wiſh I could ſay, I knew none (even of *your ſelves)* that practice otherwiſe. It is one part of the Catechiſm we teach our *Children*, to *renounce all theſe.* But there are many *Innocent and Laudable Cuſtoms* which you call *vain.* Would it not almoſt make a Man's ſtomach turn to hear one forbear, in point of Conſcience, ſaying *You* to a ſingle Perſon, becauſe it is improper; and at the ſame time, while he is ſpeaking to his Superiour, becauſe *Thou doeſt*, ſounds a little rudely, to ſoften the *Thou*, and ſay *Thee doeſt*, which is *commonly* your Peoples practice, and much more improper. Will you ever be able to prove, the Primitive Chriſtians uſed a Dialect or Dreſs different from others of their Nation and Qualities, and placed Religion in it? Does not Chriſt require *Saluting even thoſe who Salute not us?* And no doubt his, and his Apoſtles Salutations, were in the common form. In a word, There is *more Vanity* in *Singularity and Affectation,* than in a moderate following a common innocent Phraſe, Garb, or Cuſtom.

In

In your X. Article you believe (you ſay) *a Spiritual Baptiſm, and a Spiritual Supper and Communion*; but acknowledge *you diſuſe the Outward Signs*, by us commonly called Sacraments: Now did not Chriſt command Water-Baptiſm: *Go ye and Baptize all Nations*, Matth. 28. 19, 20. The Baptiſm here commanded was Water-Baptiſm: For Baptizing with the Spirit was GOD's Work, not the Apoſtles; and though the Baptiſm of the Spirit commonly accompanied Baptiſm with Water, yet not always, as in the Caſe of *Simon Magus*, and many others. Yet, did not Chriſt promiſe to *be with them* (Preaching to all Nations, and Baptizing) *to the end of the World?* Further, Did not the Apoſtles in Obedience to Chriſt's Command, both conſtantly practice, and alſo require, Water-Baptiſm to all Initiated Chriſtians? *Can any Man forbid Water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we? And he* [Peter] *commanded they ſhould be baptized:* Acts 10. 47, 48. Then as to the Outward uſe of Bread and Wine for the Lord's Supper, can any command be more Expreſs than, *This do in Remembrance of Me?* Four times repeated in the New (which you call the better) Teſtament. To which St. *Paul* adds, *It is a ſhewing forth the Lord's Death until He come*, 1 Cor. 11. 26. Now if Chriſt and his

his Apoſtles have commanded this, who hath Authoriſed you to diſuſe it? Remember what St. *Paul* tells the *Corinthians*, *he received from the Lord that which* on this Subject *de delivered to them*, 1 Cor. 11. 23. And 'tis a ſevere Paſſage in another Epiſtle of his, *Gal.* 1. 8. *If we, or an Angel from Heaven, preach any other Goſpel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accurſed.* That which lays aſide ſo much of the Old Goſpel, and ſets up a New and Variable Rule of Faith (we know not what Light within) is Another and New Goſpel.

To draw towards a Concluſion: I have written this ſhort Paper in much and true Compaſſion to you: It had been far eaſier to me to have ſaid more, than thus to have confined my ſelf: I look upon many of you as an harmleſs well-meaning People, but under ſtrong Deluſions.

This your Deluded State proceeds from your making what you call *The Light within you* (which is in many Caſes nothing but your own Preſumptive Perſuaſion or Fancy) *a Rule of Faith and Practice, Co-ordinate*, if not *Superiour and Antecedent to the Holy Scriptures*: Theſe words in your Paper [*Which are the Double and Agreeing Record of True Religion*] intimate at leaſt thus much, That you will not believe what Scripture ſaith, except the Light within you dictate the ſame, and ſo make a Dou-

a Double Record. Now my Friends, do not flatter your ſelves, *GOD is not mocked*; you muſt Anſwer at the Dreadful Day of Judgment, amongſt other Points, to ſuch as theſe; and therefore Examine your Conſciences before-hand.

1. Is it not your *main End and Study*, by pretended Mortifications, and Renouncing the World (while there are no ſort of Men alive that more eagerly purſue it, nor have more effectual, wily, and ſecret ways of getting Wealth than your ſelves?) Is it not, I ſay, your main Aim and End *to make your ſelves a Party conſiderable*, and ſuch, to which, for Reaſons of State, peculiar Priviledges muſt be indulged?

2. Are not, to this purpoſe, many of *your Diſtinctive Characters*, ſuch as your *Different Garb* (for it is plain, not a few of your Peoples Cloaths, as to Materials, are more coſtly than many of ours) your *way of ſpeaking*, yea, even *your Looks and Geſtures*, aſſumed rather to make your ſelves remarkable, and at *firſt ſight known* from other People, than out of any Perſuaſion, Senſe of Duty, or Conſcience of Obligation?

3. What reaſonable or *tolerable Warrant* can you plead for waving, *ſuppreſſing*, at leaſt, *not confeſſing* much the *greater part of the Chriſtian Faith*, and *Rejecting all Outward Poſitive Parts of Wor-*

Worſhip (eſpecially Baptiſm and the Lord's-Supper) which have ſuch plain and repeated Evidences in Holy Scripture. Your Light within, (or Senſe and Perſwaſion which you ſay you have, and are ſure is from Chriſt) foraſmuch as, in the preſent Caſes, it dictateth againſt Holy Scripture, can never be proved even to your ſelves, much leſs to others, to be from Chriſt: But muſt rather, in all reaſon, be reſolved to be one of the Heights or *Depths of Satan transforming himſelf into an Angel of Light.* And for any Perſons *to yield to ſuch Conduct (beſides or againſt Holy Scripture)* is plainly to *abandon themſelves to the Deluſions of the Devil.*

In a word therefore, I again require you, as you will anſwer all your Secret Arts and high Pretenſions at Chriſt's Tribunal, that you either *Embrace and Profeſs the intire Chriſtian Faith*, in the Points wherein I have ſhewn you to be defective; and that you receive the Chriſtian Seals or Badges, *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's-Supper*; or *elſe* that you *deſiſt to lay claim to the Name of Chriſtians.*

It is not for me to Judge you, but again I ſay unto you, (truly from GOD, as His Miniſter) *Judge your ſelves.* This is the Caſe. If Men who *take away* even from the *Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, at* leaſt *Two Thirds*

beſides many main Points of the other Third; who *Equal their own Preſumtuous Conceits to the Divine Oracles*, and Revelations; who *uſe and diſuſe at pleaſure, what parts of GOD's Inſtituted Worſhip* they think fit, Even the very Badges of Chriſtianity, (I will not here Interpoſe your Making Gain your Godlineſs) but if the aforeſaid Men are in a *Way of Perdition*, what can you conclude of your ſelves? In the Name of God Repent and Return: And from my Soul I pray, That GOD will pleaſe to give you Repentance.

EDW. CORK and *ROSS.*

Cork, July the
2d. 1698.

A

DEFENCE

Of a PAPER, Entituled,

Gospel-Truths, &c.

I Have given the *Bishop*'s *Exceptions* together at Large, as he did our Paper, and shall now Consider their Validity.

He is pleased to say at the beginning of his first Paragraph, *he is such a Reader as in our Paper we desire*: Words that gave me great hopes, of not only fair, but friendly dealing; and I heartily wish it had been so: But since it seems to me the *Reverse* of his Promise, he must not take it ill from me, if I stop a while, and shew him a little to himself, and how much he is mistaken in his own Temper, as well as in our Principles. For tho' he begins with the Names of *Moderation*, *Charity* and *Meekness*, that's all: He quickly Loses sight of them, and forgets them, with himself, almost all the way. And unless my Taste be Extreamly Depraved, there is little Relish of

thoſe Vertues in his Management, or a tolerable Temper ſhewn towards us, reſpecting either our Belief, or Practice. We deſire *ſuch a Reader* indeed as had *rather* we were in the Right, than in the Wrong; One that did not Prejudge our Caſe, and would give us (and not our Enemies) the *wording* of our own Belief: While the Biſhop but too plainly ſhews, he would not have us in the Right, Even where he dares not ſay (however freely he ſuggeſts it) that we are in the Wrong. Which appears,

Firſt, by his *Unneceſſary* Exceptions to ſuch Truths, as we have Declared in our Paper (and he cannot deny) as *imperfectly* Expreſt, becauſe we have not ſaid all that might be ſaid, to Branch them out, or Illuſtrate them; tho' enough to be underſtood by ſuch as are not Captious.

Secondly, by *Suppoſitions Incongruous*, and that can have no other Service than to *Expoſe* us, and that in a very ill Manner.

Thirdly, by rending us to *Deny*, what we don't Expreſs in our Paper: Though indeed we Believe it.

Fourthly, in not taking due notice of what is *Implied*, as well as Expreſt: Which had been but Juſt.

Fifthly, in making the *worſt* of what is not concurrent with his Belief, and not the beſt, where we believe the ſame thing.

Sixthly,

Sixthly, by Grosly Misrendering our Pretences to *Strict Living*.

Lastly, by Condemning us upon *Rumour*. All which is *more than leaning* to that side, that had *rather* we were in the Wrong, than in the Right; and Consequently not *such a Reader* as we desired. That this is so, let it but be observed, how he *Unchristians* us in his third Paragraph; tho' Immediately in a *Contradiction* to what he just before Acknowledges in his second. Nor will he allow us to be so much as *Deists* in his fourth, or at most but very Imperfect ones, because, we have not said all of God, that may be ascribed to him. In his sixth, he supposes us Capable of believing that Christ Came of *Corrupt* and *Sinful Flesh*, because we say no more in that Place, of the *Manner* of his Incarnation than the *Evangelist* doth, *John* 1. 14. Also, that we are *Defective*, at best, *Ambiguous*, about Eternal Rewards and Punishments. He makes us, in his seventh Paragraph, to *Deny* the Resurrection of the Dead, at large, and *without Distinction*, tho' we there Acknowledge a *Future State*, which implies it; and have not said one word against it; but upon all Occasions, in Print, or otherwise, have Expresst our Belief of that Branch of Christian Doctrine, *according to Scripture*. In his Tenth, he derides our Plain (though Proper) Language, of *Thou to a single Person*,

 though

though it is what he himself gives to God in his Prayers. In his Fourteenth and Fifteenth, he is pleased to slight and render our *Stricter* Living, a *Trick to promote a Party*, and that our *Garb, Looks and Gestures, are more to make our selves Remarkable, than out of any Perswasion of Duty, or Conscience:* As bad a Construction as he could make. In his Sixteenth, he tells us, *The Light within us, that we say, we have from Christ*, is rather *one of the Heighths or Depths of Satan Transformed, and that we are Abandoned to his Delusions.* So that We, and most of our Principles too, are stark Nought with the Bishop. In his Eighteenth, and last Paragraph, he suggests, *We take away Two Thirds of the Christian Faith, besides many Points of the other Third; and equal our Presumtuous Conceits, to the Divine Oracles, and Revelations, and use, and dis-use at pleasure, what part of God's Instituted Worship, we think fit; Even the very* Badges *of Christianity. I will not*, says the Bishop, *interpose* (yet suggests it) *your making Gain your Godliness; but if the Aforesaid Men, are in a way to Perdition, what can you Conclude of your selves? In the Name of God Repent and Return:* Thus the Bishop, upon a whole People, without any other Provocation, than has been Expresst.

I hope, after this, He will not Expect (I am sure he ought not) that any Body should think him *such a Reader*, as we desired,

ſired for our Goſpel-Truths, and which he promiſed us to be; or that he has treated us with the *Moderation*, *Charity*, and *Meekneſs*, he made us hope for; ſince none of our Adverſaries have uſed us much worſe, in ſo little a Compaſs. I heartily wiſh him a better ſight of himſelf, as well as of us, that he may be leſs miſtaken in both another time; for I have a reſpect for him, and deſire not to be upon theſe Terms with him, any Longer, than he thinks fit to make it neceſſary.

The reſt of his firſt Paragraph is only a Strain of Fair and *Paſtoral* Promiſes, *forgotten* by him, and not to be remembred any more, at this time, by me; and therefore ſhall proceed to his Second. Only obſerve this one thing to my Reader, and the Biſhop too, that he is pleaſed to place *Moderation* and *Charity* to our Account, becauſe he does not take us by our word *Chiefly* to mean *Only*, or *All* in reference to the things, by us believed: Which, under favour, he could not do in Juſtice; and therefore he needs not bring us in Debtor for that, which is our Due, ſince no Body ever took *Chiefly*, for *Only*, any more than an *Eldeſt*, for an *Only* Son, or an *Arch*, for an *Only* Biſhop. Nor does *Chiefly* imply *All*, any more than *Only*; for whether It regards things Humane, or Divine, It imports the *Beſt Part* of

any thing, but not *All:* The *most valuable*, that which deſerves and commands our Regard and Eſteem in the firſt place. And I leave it with my Reader, whether Believing in *God, and Chriſt, and the Holy Spirit*; and Believing the *Scriptures, and the Neceſſity of Holineſs, and Divine Worſhip*, and finally of *Eternal Rewards* and *Puniſhments*, are not Points of Faith, *Chiefly* to be Received, and Profeſſed by Chriſtians? And if they are ſuch, the Biſhop muſt have been Super-finely Critical, upon our word *Chiefly*, as well as that he might have been a better Husband of his *Moderation* and *Charity*, and have kept them for an Occaſion where they might have been *more* needed, and Conſequently *better* beſtowed.

His Second Paragraph allows us to have ſufficiently Expreſt our Chriſtian Belief in two Articles, but with this Cenſure, that of Eleven, we are *only Clear in theſe Two*, viz. *Juſtification by Chriſt*, And *Submiſſion to the Civil Government, wiſhing we may always ſtick to this Belief, and Practice*; and adds, *I heartily Rejoyce to find you acknowledge the Neceſſity of Chriſt, as a Propitiation, in order to the Remiſſion of Sins, and Juſtifying you, as Sinners, from Guilt. 'Tis the firſt time I have heard of it among you.*

If ſo: It is the Biſhop's Fault, and ſeems to me, next to Impoſſible; ſince before that Paper was given him, he was pleaſed to

Acknow-

Acknowledge he had read ſeveral of our Books; particularly, my *Riſe and Progreſs of the People called Quakers*, taking it out of his Pocket at that time; alſo *Robert Barclay*'s *Apology*, which States, and Vindicates our Principles at large, in which the two Doctrines afore-mentioned, are very clearly Declared, and Maintained, notwithſtanding he ſeems to make this look like a *New Diſcovery*. But however, I am pleaſed, that the Biſhop is ſo, at two of the *Goſpel-Truths*: I am of Opinion if he had well conſidered the Force and Comprehenſiveneſs of our Belief concerning Chriſt, that pleaſes him ſo well, he might have ſaved himſelf the Trouble of what he has publiſhed to the World upon the reſt of them: For, whoever believes in Chriſt, as a *Propitiation*, in order to *Remiſſion of Sins*, and *Juſtification of Sinners from the Guilt of Sin*, can hardly disbelieve any *Fundamental* Article of the Chriſtian Religion; ſince, every ſuch Perſon, muſt Neceſſarily believe *in God*, becauſe it is with Him alone Man is to be Juſtified. To be ſure he muſt believe *in Chriſt*, for that is the very Propoſition. He muſt alſo believe in the *Holy Ghoſt*, becauſe, he is the *Author* of his *Conviction*, *Repentance*, and *Belief*. He muſt believe *Heaven*, and *Hell*, *Rewards*, and *Puniſhment*, and Conſequently the *Reſurrection of the Juſt*, *and Unjuſt*: For, why ſhould he be Concerned, about

about being freed from the Guilt of his Sin, if he were unaccountable in another World? So that Acknowledging the Neceſſity of Chriſt, as a *Propitiation*, in order to the Remiſſion of Sin, comprehends the main Doctrine of Chriſtian Religion; and as ſo many Lines drawn from the Circumference to the Center, *they all meet and center in Chriſt*: And indeed it is as the *Navel* of Chriſtianity, and Characteriſtick of that Religion.

I would intreat Him again, to reflect well upon his own Acknowledgment, and *Commendation* of our Belief, concerning the *End*, and *Benefit* of Chriſt, to Mankind; and he cannot think us ſo deficient, much leſs, under ſuch *ſtrong and dangerous Deluſions*, as he has been pleaſed to repreſent us.

His Third *Paragraph* will not ſuffer us to be Chriſtians, notwithſtanding what we have ſaid of our Belief in Chriſt in our Paper called *Goſpel-Truths*. In one ſenſe I ſhall eaſily agree with him, for I think nothing makes any Man a *True Chriſtian*, but *Regeneration*, the Power of the Son of God *Revealed in the Soul, Converting It to God: For the Devils Believe, and Tremble* too, and yet are Devils *ſtill*; they Believe what is *True*, but they do not *Truly Believe* in him that is True: They know and aſſent to the Propoſitions of Truth, or Articles of Faith, and knew *Him* to be

Chriſt

Christ too, when He came of old, and called him by His *Name*, but this did not make True Christians *Then* of them: Nor yet does an *Assent Now* to all the Truths of the Gospel, *Truly Qualifie* Men Christians, *unless they feel the Power of them, upon their Hearts.* And I would have my Reader reflect well upon this Great and Essential Truth, tho' he were as Big as a *Bishop*: For a *New Creature* is the Business; an *Orthodox Life*, the *Cross* of Christ, which is the *Narrow way of Self-denial.* Yet I must say, That whoever declares, he believes in Christ as his *Sacrifice* and *Sanctifier*, which is to save both from the Guilt and Pollution of Sin, is a *Professor of Christianity*, and may reasonably be allowed to be a *Christian at large.* And that what we have declared, in our *Third*, *Fourth*, *Fifth*, and *Sixth Gospel-Truth*, comprehends the Belief beforementioned, my Just and Sober Reader may satisfie himself in the perusal thereof.

His Fourth Paragraph faults our first Article, as he is pleased to call it, with great *Shortness and Imperfection concerning our Belief of God*; for tho' he says we own his *Providence as to the other Life*, yet *we say nothing, as to the Creation of this present World, and Providence over it*: But with the Bishop's leave, He that believes in God, believes in all that's necessary to the Supreme Being. 'Tis what he, and all

all Christans, take for granted, and allow, as often as they hear any one say, *He believes in God.* For not to be believe Him *Omnipotent*, *Omniscient*, and *Omnipresent*, is not to believe him to be God, being inseparable from the Divine Nature. I must appeal to the Bishop, whether a small Grain of Charity would not have excused us from his Reflection upon this Head. We have said more than *Moses* said to *Pharaoh*: For besides that, *I am*, is no more than, *He is*; We have added that *He is*, the *Rewarder* of *all Men*, *according to their Works*. We gave the Text, as it is, and the very Text seems expres't for a *Declaration of Faith in God*, viz. *He, that will come to God, must believe that He is, and that He is a Rewarder, of them that seek Him.* The Text does not Enumerate and Require the Belief of all the Divine Attributes, and Properties that are in God, but the bare Belief of his Being, and what He is to Mankind that fear him. And whatever the Bishop says, this is enough for a Man to come to God, though not enough, it seems, to come to the Bishop in the Quality of a Believer: He must help the Holy Ghost to speak Properly, or we, that speak after him, must be *deficient* in our Expressions, if not our Belief. But when any one affirms, that Man was created by God, is he Short, Fallacious, or Equivocal, because he does not say *how* God made Man, or *what* he made him?

him? Is not his *Body*, *Soul*, and *Spirit*, his *Will*, *Understanding*, *Memory* and *Affections* comprized, and meant, under that word *Man*? Besides, could the Bishop think that while we own God's greater Providence, his lesser could be disbelieved by us? He that has the alone Power of *Rewarding* Men, in the other World, according to their Works in this, must certainly be the *Sovereign of Both*; and his Providence, in Justice, is to be so understood. And as it is most certain that we believe of God, all that the Holy Scriptures declare of him, and whatsoever is proper to that Great and Glorious Being; so, had we not thought it unnecessary to be more particular, from the Common Notion all Men have of the Deity, the Bishop could have had no room left for the Exercise of his Charity.

In his Fifth Paragraph he Blames us of being Defective in our Confession of the *Holy Trinity*: Though we give it in the very Terms of the Holy Ghost, 1 *John* 15. 7. If this is not a sufficient Text to prove the *Trinity*, that *Antiquity* Urges, and also *Modern* Writers of the *Church* of *England*, to prove it, I know not where to find one, in the Scripture.

It is Generally Believed the Apostle *John* gave this Declararation to the *first Christians*, to *prevent* their being deluded by *Cerinthius*.

How

How come the Bishop then to render it but a *by passage*, and otherwise intended by the Apostle, than for an *Article of Faith* about the Trinity? Is there a plainer, or a fuller any where in the Writings of the New Testament? Three and yet *One*, is the Doctrine of the *Trinity*: And no other Apostle has gone so far, or been so Express: Insomuch that the Text has been doubted, and render'd *Apocryphal* by such as do not believe the Common Doctrine of the *Trinity*; and *Foisted* in to serve the turn of *Trinitarians*: So plain it has been thought to their purpose, even by the *Anti-Trinitarians*. How then is the Text defective with the Bishop? But he says the Apostle writ it *upon occasion*: Doubtless he did so. But what other Occasion, I pray, than that of the *Holy Trinity*? He adds, *And it was to the Apostles purpose*, touching the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*: But what purpose could the Apostle have, but that of Declaring the *Trinity*, and yet *Unity*? What other Use does he make of it? The Bishop must be very hard put to it, certainly, to shift of, and lessen our Confession in this Point, and Rather than fail, render the Text it self short; which, with submission, I think is a *bold Attempt in one* of his Station, if he Believes the Thirty Nine Articles.

The

The next and sixth Paragraph, relating to our third *Gospel-Truth*, is large, and consists of divers Branches, and therefore I shall Consider them distinctly and apart. *In the third Article, You acknowledge indeed the Son of God to have been made Flesh, but neither Conceived by the Holy Ghost, nor Born of the Virgin* Mary: *So that it does not appear, by this your Confession, but that he was at first an Ordinary, Corrupt and Sinful Person.* I think it is hardly to be supposed that we could intend so Gross a thing, or that it is inferrible from the Manner of Expressing of our selves, in Reference to *Christ's Manifestation in the Flesh.* Where Enough is said, to Comprehend the Rest, all is Meant, tho' all be not Expresst: We call him the *Beloved Son of God*, the *Only Begotten of the Father:* Pray what is that short of being *Conceived by the Holy Ghost?* To be sure, it is very far from a *Corrupt* and *Sinful Person*, a Supposition as remote from what we said, as from what the Bishop promised, viz. *Charity.* He that Confesses the word *was made Flesh*, Confesses Him made Flesh *by God*, and therefore made Holy Flesh: For God never made any *Corrupt* or *Sinful* Flesh. If the place is read, as some do, *viz.* the Word *took Flesh*, the Flesh must be Holy, for he would not take, or dwell in *Sinful* Flesh.

And had the Bishop well remembered what he *Acknowledged*, upon our Believing Christ

to

to be a Propitiation for Sin, not many lines before, he could never have Suggeſted ſo unreaſonable, as well as uncharitable a Conceit, ſince *Sinful Fleſh*, or a *Corrupt Perſon could never be any part of a Sacrifice for Sin:* So that in Commending that part of our Belief, he has ſufficiently ſecured us againſt this part of his Inſinuation. But the Biſhop proceeds to Aggravate our Shortneſs in Expreſſion to a Severe Imputation, *viz.* that we *own him not ſo much as Jeſus or the Chriſt.*

This muſt be a great overſight of the Biſhop, not to ſay worſe, when the very Fourth Head, about *Juſtification by Chriſt*, of which he declares himſelf ſo well ſatisfied, *Thrice* confeſſes him to be *Chriſt*, viz. in the *Firſt*, *Third* and *Fourth Lines*. Again, we call him *Chriſt* in the *Firſt Line* of the Fifth Goſpel-Truth; likewiſe in the *Firſt* and *Fourth Lines* of the Sixth we call him *Chriſt:* We do the ſame in the *Firſt* and *Fifth Lines* of the Eighth, and in the *Firſt Line* of our Tenth Goſpel-Truth: How the Biſhop came to miſs in ſo Palpable a Point of Fact, in the Compaſs of one half ſide of a Sheet of Paper, I cannot Imagine, and am unwilling to Cenſure. Nor would I willingly think the Biſhop ſo Trifling, as well as Diſingenious, as to Excuſe himſelf herein, becauſe we do not call the Word that took Fleſh by the Name of Chriſt in *that place*, ſince the Biſhop Repeats it from us

us, out of our aforesaid Fourth Head, about *Justification by Christ*, where we call him by the Name of *Christ*, as may be seen in the Second and foregoing Paragraph of his Reflections. Besides, we have not Confessed his Name less than *Nine times* in that Paper. But if the Bishop could yet insist upon the word *Christ* not being in our Third Head, I say the Thing is there, though the Word be not. For what is Christ but the *Word made Flesh*, and who is the Word made Flesh but *Jesus Christ*? Again, who is the Beloved Son of God but *Christ*, and who else but Christ is the *Beloved Son of God*, and *Only Begotten of the Father, full of Grace and full of Truth*: For these High and Distinguishing Characters are to be found in *That* very Head of Doctrine, where the Bishop will not have us to acknowledge him to be *Christ*. So that unless a *Corrupt* and *Sinful* Person can be full of *Grace* and *Truth*, I wonder how the Bishop came to suppose a thing, in our Name, so very Gross. But he proceeds in the same Paragraph, *You acknowledge indeed he died for Sin, but you have not one Word of his Resurrection from the Dead, or of his Ascention into Heaven, which it may be proved some of you have expresly denied, saying, he is not ascended into Heaven, he is in us*: With more to this Effect. I should be sorry to tax the Bishop here of *Absurdity* and *Uncharitableness*; but

who can help it? For if Christ be not Risen, He is *still* in his *Grave*; He is no more. How then do we assert him to be a *Propitiation*, and the *Light* and *Life* of his People? See *Gospel-Truth* 3, 4, 5, and 6. Can that which is Dead *Sanctifie* and *Justifie* Believers? Can the Dead give us *Grace* and the *Holy Spirit*? Or have we not said so of Christ, that he is the *Giver* thereof? And if we have said so, must not the Bishop be Extreamly beside the business? His Uncharitableness is as obvious, I will not say his Untruth; but I must pray him to Reflect a little better upon what he has writ; for unless he would make us to mean the *Grave*, when we say that Wicked Men shall never come where Christ is gone, *Gospel-Truth* 6. he must allow that we acknowledge Christ to be in *Heaven*, and Consequently *Ascended*. What shall I say to his Story of some of our *Friends*, whom he makes to affirm that Christ is not ascended into Heaven, he is in us? Can it touch us, or should he have said it, and not have proved it? Is that fair and candid? Is it Charitable, Supposing it were true, which does not appear? Or is it Just to Insinuate it upon the People as *Dubious*? But let it be never so true, it cannot Conclude the People, if not the *Act* of the People. The Church of *England* has Doctors of very different Sentiments; would the Bishop think

it

it fair the Common Belief of the Church ſhould thereby be concluded? It is true, and a great and comfortable Truth, *that Chriſt is in us*, according to 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. *Gal.* 2. 16. *Col.* 1. 26, 27. but not *Confined* to Man: He is not ſo there, as that he is *no where elſe*, and leaſt of all that he is not in *Heaven.* For the Apoſtle tells us, *Eph.* 4. 10. that He *Aſcended far above all Heavens, that he might fill all things*; then he is *in Man* certainly. So that our aſſerting that Doctrine of the *Indwelling* of Chriſt *in Man*, does not make void his being *elſewhere*, becauſe he is *every where*: Tho in Heaven moſt Gloriouſly, without doubt, being there *Glorified with the Glory that he had with the Father before the World began.* And they that Thus believe in Chriſt cannot deny his being at God's *Right Hand*, which ſignifies, according to Scripture, *Philip* 2. 9, 10, 11. the Higheſt Exaltation: Nor yet to be their *Mediator*, for that is inſeparable from his being their Propitiation. So that though we did not *dwell* upon Points, but were Concice in our Expreſſions, yet whatever is *Implied* or is *Implicable* from any Aſſertion, *Juſtice*, as well as Charity always grants; and ſo would the Biſhop have done, had they been Uppermoſt in his Mind when his Pen ran ſo faſt againſt us. I muſt own it was not writ for *Criticks*, but for ſuch Readers as the Biſhop ſays he was, or ſhould have been,

to wit, who Exercise *Moderation* and *Charity*; more of which, I hope he thinks as well as I, will do him no harm.

But it disturbs the Bishop that we have said nothing of *Christ's coming to Judgment*, nor of the *End of the World*, whether it be *Dissolvable* or *Eternal*. For the first, it is implied in our making all Men *Accountable to God*, for their Deeds done in the World. For the Other, it was not under our Consideration, being not objected to us. But they that say as much of Christian Doctrine as we have done in those *Eleven Heads* of our Paper, did never yet, that I have heard, believe the *Eternity* of this World, *Heb.* 1. 10, 11, 12.

Yet again says the Bishop, *Not a word of one Church, which it may be feared you strike out of your Belief, because you are resolved never more to return into the Unity of the Church, but to make and maintain a Schism or Party for ever.*

These are very harsh Constructions, besides that they beg the Question, and in my Opinion would have past better from a Person whose Office was less concerned in *Charity* than That of a Bishop: But why, pray, must *Interest* and *Obstinacy* Rule our Dissent? What's to be got by it? *Profit* and *Preferment* go the Bishop's Way, I will not say he goes Theirs,

But

But why not *Conſcience*, tho it were miſtaken, ſince we have been all along of the *Looſing* ſide? Which is not uſually eſpouſed by the Men of *Intereſt*; nor are Men ordinarily Obſtinate againſt their *Intereſt*. Let us at leaſt be Honeſt Men and allowed to mean well though we were miſtaken. But what Church, of the many Churches in *Europe* is the Biſhop's One Church, to which he would have us return? He has not told us. Methinks he that cenſures our Shortneſs ſo much, ſhould not have been deficient himſelf in ſo material a Point. So that if we are out of the way, we muſt be ſo ſtill for all the Biſhop; ſince we are yet to ſeek what Church we Err from, or ſhould repair to. But I will ſuppoſe he means his Own, by which he excludes the *Lutheran* and *Calviniſt*; the *Presbyterian*, *Independant* and *Baptiſt*, as well as the People called *Quakers*, from being of his One Church; to ſay nothing of the *Roman Catholick* or *Greek* Churches. But unleſs the One Church, as he phraſes it, by which I underſtand him to Intend the true One, may be of two minds, it will be difficult for him to recommend his own above the reſt, becauſe that is not only broken in *Sentiments*, but *Practice* too, and which the Biſhop knows is no longer a *Secret*. I might mention the Differences warmly managed between the Doctors of it, about *Grace* and *Free-will*; one

taking the *Calviniſt*, the other the *Arminian* way; as they alſo do about the Doctrine of *Satisfaction* and *Juſtification*. Likewiſe the late Controverſie between two Famous Men of the Church, about the *Trinity*, who are followed in their differing Sentiments by great Numbers of the Learned of the Biſhops *One Church*: And for that Reaſon (if no other) I cannot be ſo well ſatisfied of his exact Correſpondence with all the Articles of that Church himſelf. And I hope I am not beſide the buſineſs, when I ſay it would very well have become the Biſhop to have told us what it is he would have us believe, when he found ſo much fault with what that Paper ſays we do believe. It would be too long, and perhaps he might think it beſides the buſineſs, at leaſt the brevity the Caſe requires, to give him the Reaſons of our *Separation* and *Diſſent* or *Diſagreement* with the Church. I put theſe Words together, becauſe ſome were never Members of it, and ſo they could not properly be ſaid to ſeparate from it; but true it is, we may all be ſaid to Diſſent or Diſagree; and I would think the Biſhop ſhould not be much to ſeek for the Reaſons of it. And yet where we are vulgarly apprehended to differ moſt, we diſſent leaſt, I mean in Doctrine, which is the reaſon ſo many have upon occaſion ſaid, as indeed did the Biſhop at the Viſit I made him: *viz. Why we believe*

the

the same, 'tis what we Preach as well as you. For except it be the wording of some of the Articles of Faith in *School Terms*, there are very few of them profest by the Church of *England*, to which we do not heartily Assent. And this I have expreſt for my self, and in behalf of my *Friends* in my *Key*, and *Primitive Christianity revived.* But of this and the more material Reasons of our distance from the Church, I may have occasion to expreſs my self at the Closure of this *Vindication.*

But the Bishop proceeds in his Sixth Paragraph: *Nor have you a word of the Resurrection of the Body, which divers of you have been known to deny, and others of you only say, It may be so.* I shall consider this Immediately upon the next Paragraph, where he treats upon the same subject, and apply my self to his conclusion of this: Lastly, Tho' *you acknowledge everlasting Rewards for them that fear God, yet nothing of the everlasting Punishment of wicked Men.* I think we do, and that the Bishop aggravates his disingenuity to us upon this Head: For the Words of the Paper are these, *It is our Belief that God is, and that he is a Rewarder of all them that fear him, with Eternal Rewards of Happiness; and that those that fear him not shall be turned into Hell.* The Scriptures are, *Heb.* 11. 6. *Rev.* 22. 12. *Rom.* 2. 5, 6, 7, 8. *Psalm.* 9. 17. Now tho *Eternal* is not joyn-

ed to *Hell*, yet Juſtice as well as Candor would have underſtood it ſo, and to mean the *Hell of the damned*, the *Puniſhment of Evil Doers after this Life*, according to, the Ancient, Common Belief. But the Biſhop that ſeldom fails to make the *Worſt* of every thing for us, Thus Comments upon our Words. *You mention Hell indeed, but whether you mean thereby the Grave, as moſt commonly in Scripture is meant, or a Place of Temporal Puniſhment after this Life, as ſome have done, or a State of total Deſtruction and Annihilation, as many now a-days do, no One knows.* But with the Biſhop's leave, what if we mean None of Theſe, may we not be in the right for all that? For what if none of theſe are the Ancient, Common and Scripture Belief, what will the Biſhop do then? Since One would think that one of them is the Biſhop's Hell, becauſe he gives Us and his Reader no more *Room* for our meaning, or any other Belief of a Hell. And either one of theſe is an Article of *his* Belief, or elſe he keeps the true Hell to himſelf, and was not ſo juſt as to include that in the Queſtion with the reſt, leſt he ſhould be thereby guilty of ſuppoſing us capable of meaning the *True* One in our *Goſpel-Truths*, viz. *The Worm that never dies, the Fire that never goes out, where is weeping and gnaſhing of Teeth for ever:* See 2 Theſſalonians 1. 9. Jude 6. 7. And which, I think, is none of the Three the Biſhop

ſhop mentions. However, he abundantly ſhews his Inclination to repreſent us rather Wrong than Right, in our Belief: For if the Scriptures by us cited are conſulted, they plainly ſhew we never meant the *Grave*, and that they *Equally* Refer to the Future State of the Souls of Men; *viz. That all ſhall receive the Recompence of their Works, and the Rewards of their Deeds*, according to the *Nature* and *Quality* of them. And if the Rewards of the Righteous are Eternal, then ſo muſt thoſe of the Wicked be, or both muſt be Temporary: For the Holy Ghoſt makes *no Difference* as to the Duration of the one more than of the other. One Grain of a Truly Chriſtian Temper, had ſaved the Biſhop, and he me, the Trouble of this as well as of other Reflections.

I am now come to his *Seventh Paragraph*, the firſt part of which is a heavy Complaint of our *Shortneſs* and *Deficiency* in Expreſſing of our Belief. We, it ſeems, are *too General* in ſome Points, and *Wave* Others; he is pleaſed to ſay *Eight* of Twelve, but Inſtances only in that of the *Reſurrection*; tho he conjures us at the ſame time, upon our Eternal Account, to conſider what he ſays. Now if being General and keeping to the terms of Scripture be a Fault, we are like to be more vile with the Biſhop: For thanks be to God, *That, only* is our *Creed*, and with good reaſon too, ſince it

is

is fit *That* ſhould only conclude and be the *Creed* of Chriſtians, which the Holy Ghoſt could only Propoſe and Require us to believe. For if the *Comment* is made the Creed inſtead of the *Text*, from that time we believe not in God but in Man. I heartily wiſh none had been wiſe *above* what is written, and that Generals had *Concluded* Chriſtians: Then Charity had been *better* Maintained, and Piety Promoted: Whereas *Strains* or *Refines* upon the Text, have thrown us into thoſe Labrinths of Controverſie, that the Zeal which ſhould have been Imployed to ſuppreſs *Sin* in all its Branches, has too Generally been uſed to Fire one Party upon Another, till Practice, which is *Religion indeed*, was blown up by the Generality. So much for our *Shortneſs* or *Wavering*, as the Biſhop calls it.

I ſhall now attend his only neceſſary Point of Eight, that he thought fit to mention, which he ſays we either ſuppreſs or wave, viz. *The Reſurrection of the Dead:* I confeſs I did not think that any Body would have been ſo uncharitable to us, after our Acknowledging the *Future State of the Juſt and Unjuſt*, ſince that implies it, and every *Medium* to it. However I will attend what the Biſhop urges for Proof of what we *don't* deny, but always muſt the Slander of doing ſo.

ſo. *I will* (ſays he) *only mind you of two Paſſages out of the Scripture of Truth*, 1 Cor. 15. 16, 17. *If the Dead riſe not, your Faith is vain, you are yet in your Sins.* Hence it appears (ſays the Biſhop) all other Points of Faith are *in vain, if this be not true.* And ſo ſay I, as well as the Biſhop, and ſhall always ſay as he ſays, while he ſays no more than the Text ſays: For who can think that allows himſelf to think, that we ſhould not believe an *Immortality*, who have expoſed our ſelves, and ſuffered ſo much that we may obtain *an happy One.* But the Queſtion is not whether the Dead Riſe, *But with what Bodies?* For if the Dead Riſe not, then may we ſay with the Apoſtle, Verſe 19. in the ſame Chapter, *We are of all Men moſt Miſerable.* So that the Reſurrection of the Dead is out of all Diſpute with us: But with *What Body*, will I believe, be One, *till the Dead Riſe.*

Here it is we are *Cautious*, and tread *Softly*; Remembring what the Apoſtle ſays to the *Curious* and *Inquiſitive* upon this Head, Verſe 35, 36, 37, 38. *But ſome Man will ſay, How are the Dead raiſed up, And with what Bodies do they come? Thou Fool, thou ſoweſt not that Body which ſhall be, but bare Grain.* —— *But God giveth it a Body* as it hath pleaſed him, *and to every Seed his own Body.* Here is the Ground of our Caution, which the Biſhop is pleaſed to call *Suppreſſing*, and others *denying* of the Reſurrection

rection. We have indeed been *Negative* to the Groſs Conceits of People concerning the Riſing of this *Carnal Body*, we carry about us, which better agrees with the *Alcoran of Mahomet*, than the Goſpel of Chriſt. But that there is a *Reſurrection of the Juſt and Unjuſt to Rewards and Puniſhments*, we have *ever believed*. And indeed we cannot but wonder that any ſhould be *diſpleaſed* with us for being *Pleaſed with that which God is pleaſed to give us*. Bodies we ſhall have, *but not the ſame* ſays the Apoſtle, and ſo believes the Quaker; *but God giveth every one a Body as pleaſeth him*, and that *Pleaſeth us*, whoever it diſpleaſeth: For we had *rather* be called Fools *Ten times* by the Biſhop than *Once* by the Apoſtle, which we think we ſhould deſerve, if we ſhould dare to *ſtretch* the Text, or preſume to *define* the Secret.

The other Scripture urged by the Biſhop, in defence of what we *never oppoſed*, is *Rom.* 10. 9. *If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy Mouth the Lord Jeſus, and believe in thine Heart, that God hath raiſed him from the Dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved.* He adds, *Thoſe who believe this as they ſhould do, ſhall be ſaved.* But that we have *left out both Chriſt's Reſurrection, and our Own in our Faith.* In the firſt part of his Note, I agree with him, that all who *Rightly* believe the Text, will be ſaved: For that muſt be by

by the *Illumination* and *Working* of the Saving Power of Christ in the Heart, that he can so believe. But that we have left out *Christ*'s *Resurrection* and *our Own*, is a mistake already observed, because they are both *plainly Implied*; one in our Belief of Christ's being a *Propitiation* for Sin, and the *Light*, *Life* and *Strength*, of his People, and in giving us his *Grace* and *Holy Spirit*, which that which is Dead cannot do: And our own Resurrection is sufficiently secured in our declared Belief of *Rewards* and *Punishments*; tho the Mode of it be not Expreſt: Nor was there any reason for saying more upon that Head with respect to the Occasion of our Papers being Published.

I am now come to the Bishop's *Eighth* Paragraph, which Comprehends his Exceptions to Three of our *Gospel-Truths*, viz. the *5th*, *6th*, and *7th*, which wholly relate to the Doctrine of the *Light of Christ within Man*. And I am truly sorry to find the Bishop at so great a loss, as that Paragraph shews him, about so *Excellent and Evident a Principle*; and which so very much concerns him, and indeed All Men to know. And that my Reader may Inform himself throughly in this Matter, I must desire him to look back and read those Three *Gospel-Truths*, and compare them with the Bishop's Eighth Paragraph, and he will make himself much a better

Judge

Judge of the Validity of the Biſhop's Anſwer and my Reply, and which of us two keeps cloſeſt to the Doctrine and Language of the holy Scriptures, that he in the ſame Paragraph ſeems ſo much to Reſpect.

His firſt Exception in this Parapraph is at our *Incapacity:* For he ſays we have *never been able yet, that he could find, to make out what we mean by the Light of Chriſt within.* Perhaps the Biſhop has never ſought, or has ſought amiſs; which as great and learned Men as himſelf have done before now, and ſo miſt what they have ſought for: And then it cannot be a wonder, that he has not found out what we mean by the *Light of Chriſt in Man.* But that a Biſhop ſhould repreſent this an uninteligible Doctrine, after reading ſo diſtinct and plain an account of it in *R. B*'s Apology, not to mention divers other Books; and which is of greater Authority, the Scriptures of Truth, is no ordinary Surpriſe to me. Has the Biſhop forgot the firſt of *John*, and the *4th*, *9th* and *16th* Verſes, where ſpeaking of the Word-God, he ſays *in him was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men.*

This is that Light of Chriſt the *Quakers* Aſſert, and deſire to turn the Minds of all People too. For all muſt have it, if it be

the

the Light of all, as the Text plainly tells us it is. The Ninth Verſe is yet more expreſs, viz. *That was the True Light which lighteth Every Man that cometh into the World*; then which, nothing can be more Expreſt to our purpoſe. And that the Biſhop ſhould feel no ſhare in this Glorious Light of Men, renders him very unfit, methinks, for an Overſeer of them.

I know ſome read this Text otherwiſe, as indeed he did to me in *Cork*. viz. *That was the true Light*, That Coming *into the World lighteth all Men*; referring the word *Coming* to Chriſt, and not to Man. But all the Verſions I ever met with, and I have ſeen more than twenty, render the verſe as it is in our Engliſh Tranſlations: And all Criticks and Commentators, except the followers of *Socinus*, Read and Render it *as we do*. And while we have ſo much Company and ſo great Authority, I think we need not be Solicitous about the ſucceſs of this point. But beſides that the foregoing verſe tells us, that the Divine Life of the Word-God, *is the Light of Men*, which ſhews all Mankind have it in them (for it is the Light of their *Minds*, and not of their Bodies) it is impoſſible that Interpretation ſhould be true in a ſtrict Senſe: For the Coming of Chriſt in that Bleſſed manifeſtation was to the *Jews only*: He ſays it himſelf, he

was

was not sent but to the lost Sheep of the House of Israel, Matth. 13. 24. *Again, he came unto his own, and his own received him not*, John 1. 11. And within that narrow compass he could not be said to be the Light of all Mankind that *had*, *did* and *should* come into the World, for so both the *4th* and *9th* Verse plainly import, *viz.* The Light of Mankind, without restriction to This or That Manifestation of God to Men.

But the Bishop is still at a loss what to make of this Light, and what we would be at; for, says he, *You will not allow it to be either the natural Rational Faculty, or common Innate Notions, or natural Conscience, or Conscience Illuminated, by the preaching of the Gospel, and the Operation of the Holy Ghost thereby.* We, say we would have it to be what the Scriptures say it to be, *viz. The Light of Christ*, the Son of God, who called himself, *John* 8. 12. *the Light of the World*; and if so, then *Every Mans Light*; *the Light of every Mind and Understanding*, and consequently *the Light of Christ within*, too hard it seems for the Bishop to comprehend, and yet so very easie, to the meanest Capacity that observes the Discoveries and Convictions of it in their own Hearts.

But since it is, as he rightly terms it, *a Fundamental* with us, we will follow the Bishop, in his Inquiries a little further. We say first then,

then, It is not the *Natural Rational Faculty* of Man; for then It would be *Man*, or a part of his *Compoſition*, meerly as Man: But that It is not, but a *Manifeſtation* in the Soul of Man, *of Chriſt, the Word God, the Light of the World, the Second Adam, the Lord from Heaven, the Quickning Spirit; who was full of Grace and Truth*, and *of whom* Man hath received, *Grace for Grace*: To wit, a *Tallent*, a Proportion ſuited to his Want and Capacity, to Convince and Convert him, to Renew and Reſtore him from his great Lapſe unto God, his Bleſſed Maker, again. In ſhort, our *Natural Rational Faculty* is our *Sight*, but not our *Light*: That, by which we diſcern and judge what the Divine Light ſhews us, *viz. Good* from *Evil*, and *Error* from *Truth*. But as the *Eye* of the Body is the Senſible Faculty of ſeeing External Objects, through the Diſcovery that an External Light (as the *Sun* in the Firmament) makes to the Eye, but is not That *Light* it ſelf; ſo does the Rational Faculty of the Soul *ſee* Spiritual or Immaterial *Objects*, through the *Illumination of the Light of Chriſt within*, but is by no means That *Light it ſelf*, any more than the *Eye* is the *Sun*, or *John* the *Baptiſt* was our bleſſed Lord and Saviour *Jeſus Chriſt*, that was but *Servant* and *Fore-runner* of his bleſſed Manifeſtation in the Fleſh.

As for the Bishop's *Innate Notions*, and *Natural Conscience* if by them he means Impressions, or Principles which are born and *come with us* into the World, *viz.* the *Law of God in the Heart of Man*; I must tell him, first, that this is not the Language of the *Law* and *Testimony* he refers us to in the same Paragraph: And next, that as the *Work* is not the *Workman*, so They are not properly the *Light* of Christ, but the blessed *Fruit* and *Effect* of the Light of Christ, the Word-God in Man, which shines in the Heart, and gives him the Knowledge of God, and of his Duty to Him. So that the Innate Notions, or *Inward Knowledge* we have of God, is from *This true Light that lighteth every Man, coming into the World*, but is not *that Light it self*. Just so the Bishop's Natural Conscience, must only mean a *Capacity* that Man *has by Nature*; that is, in his *Creation*, of making a *Judgment* of himself, his Duty, and Actions, according to the Judgment of God manifested to him by the *Light of Christ within*. Not that such a Capacity is *That Light*; but that it *sees* or *understands* by the Inshining of the Divine Light, the things that belong to Man's Duty and Peace.

Nor is it *Conscience* Illuminated, *by the preaching of the Gospel, and the Operation of the Holy Ghost thereon*, which is the last of the Bishop's Constructions; but *That very Principle of Life and*

and Light, which Illuminates the Conſcience, and was the very *Spring* and *Force* of the *Apoſtolical Miniſtry*, and of the *Conviction* and *Converſion* of their Hearers; and which Opened their Hearts to receive the Goſpel when preach'd unto them. In ſhort, this Excellent Principle is in Man, but not *of Man*, but of God. The Nature of it is to *Diſcover* Sin, *Reprove* for It, and *Lead* out of It, all ſuch as *Love* and *Obey* the Convictions thereof. It is a Principle of *Divine* Life that *Quickens* the *Obedient* Heart to *Newneſs* of Life: It *Raiſes* the Mind *above* the World to God, and *ſearches out* and *reveals the Deep things of God* to the humble and waiting Soul. And be it known to the Biſhop, and all that with him profeſs Ignorance about what we mean by the *Light of Chriſt within Man*, This is It I have been treating of; and I have writ, I bleſs Almighty God, My own Experience, the *Taſte* and *Reliſh* I have had of Its *Excellency* and *Sufficiency* in the Courſe of far the greater and beſt part of my Life.

But the Biſhop muſt excuſe me if I ſay, I cannot but take it very Ill at his hands, to forbid us in his following Words, *to pretend to give an Account of what we Believe, unleſs we can make him underſtand our meaning*: And, becauſe he does not penetrate our Senſe, to call our way of Wording that bleſſed Principle of the Light of Chriſt in Man, a *Perfect*

Banter. This to me is one of the ſevereſt Perſecutions, becauſe Spiritual things, are only to be *Spiritually* diſcerned and underſtood. I would fain know how a Regenerate Man can poſſibly make a Carnal Man underſtand the *New Birth*? It is certainly the Gift of God to *underſtand* Divine Truths, as well as Rightly to Believe. So that ſuppoſing our Aſſertion of the Nature, Power, and Excellency of the Light of Chriſt in Man to be true, not to have leave to ſay ſo, unleſs we could make every Man rightly take our Senſe and Meaning, *whether he be Spiritually Diſcerning, or not*, looks *Antichriſtian* as well as Unreaſonable. *We ſpeak Wiſdom*, ſays the Apoſtle, *among them that are perfect*, 1 Cor. 7. 6. It ſeems others underſtand him not, muſt He therefore not have wrought of the things of God? The very Preaching of the Goſpel was Fooliſhneſs to the *Wiſelings* of *Jews* and *Greeks*; they could make neither Head nor Tail of It, by *Their way* of Judging of *Truth*: Muſt not the Goſpel therefore be preach'd? When the Apoſtle *Paul* preach'd to the *Athenians*, ſome of the Men of the *Gown*, the Philoſophers of that Time, Oppoſed and Deſpiſed him, ſaying, *What will this Babbler ſay?* But had they known what he meant, we cannot think they would have ſaid ſo to Him. Was the Apoſtle then, or the *Athenians* in fault, that they did not underſtand Him? Or, was

it

it *Bantering* as well as *Babbling*, becauſe he did not make them underſtand his meaning; which is only the Work of the Holy Ghoſt to do? Who was it, I pray, that ſaid *The World by Wiſdom knew not God?* And can we ſuppoſe any thing elſe blinded the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, and the High-Prieſt of the *Jews*, from diſcerning the *Meſſiah* when He came? For they wanted not *Academical* Learning, if that could have enlightned them; nor yet the *Scriptures*, but they *Reſiſted* the Holy Ghoſt their *only True Interpreter*, and ſo ſtumbled and fell. Let the Biſhop alſo have a Care.

In the Second Chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, he will find that the Apoſtle ſpake the Wiſdom of God in a *Myſtery*, *which the Princes of this World knew not*, with all their Wiſdom: *For the things of God*, ſays the Apoſtle, *knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of God*; by which thoſe Chriſtians, knew thoſe things that were *freely given to them of God. Which thing alſo we ſpeak*, ſays He, *not in the Words which Mans Wiſdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghoſt teacheth, comparing Spiritual things with Spiritual. But the Natural Man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are fooliſhneſs unto him: Neither can he know them, becauſe they are Spiritually diſcerned.* Now, according to the Biſhop's treatment of us, the Apoſtle ought not to have writ of Faith and Salvation, unleſs he could have made all that

read his Writings *understand* his Meaning. And it must be a *perfect Banter*, to talk of speaking Wisdom in a *Mystery*, and not in the Terms that Man's Wisdom teacheth.

But the Lord Jesus Christ was of another Mind, when he said, *I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, because thou hast* hid *these things* (the Truths of the Kingdom) *from the Wise and Prudent, and Reveal'd them unto Babes: Even so Father, for so it seem'd good in thy sight.* It is hence beyond all Dispute that God *hideth* the Mysteries of His Kingdom from the Wisdom of Man, when *Simplicity and Sincerity* fail not to *Reach* and *Understand* them. Here it was that poor *Nicodemus* was absolutely *at a loss* for Christ's meaning, when Christ said, *Unless a Man be Born again, he can in no wise enter the Kingdom of God*, John 3. Insomuch as he asked Christ, upon his Discourse of the *New Birth*, *How can these things be?* At which Christ seems to admire, in a sort of Reproof upon *Nicodemus*, *Art thou a Master of* Israel, *and knowest not these things?* As much as to say, Art thou, a Man of thy Station in the Church of God, Ignorant of the Way to Heaven? Whoever reads that notable Interview between Christ and *Nicodemus*, will find that Christ resolves the Matter into *Two Births*, That which is Born of the *Flesh*, and that which is Born

of the *Spirit*, and theſe are Contrary: And therefore no wonder if they *differ* in their Underſtanding of the Holy Scriptures, being a Declaration of the *Faith* and *Experience*, as well as *Doctrine* and *Practice* of the Servants of God that were Enlightned and Born of the Holy Ghoſt. Nor is this all; for *they that are Born of the Fleſh, Perſecute them that are Born after the Spirit*: So that when they can *no longer* commit Violence upon their Perſons and Eſtates, they will Perſecute them with their *Tongues* and *Pens*: They are *Hereticks*, *Blaſphemers*, *Illiterate* and *Ignorant*, yet *Preſumptuous*; *Enemies* to *Cæſar*, and *Diſobedient* to Government, if they will not give God's due unto Man, viz. *Conſcience*. And if they chooſe to deliver themſelves in *Scripture* Stile, and ſpeak earneſtly of the Neceſſity of the Work of the *Spirit* of God, in order to an *Experimental* and *Saving* Knowledge of the Truth, declared in Holy Scripture; and that *Chriſt's Miniſters* are made by the *Holy Ghoſt*, and not by *Humane* Learning; and that the Worſhip, which is acceptable to God, muſt be *in the Spirit* and *in the Truth*; that is, with *Clean Hearts* and Right Spirits, *Kindl'd* and *Inflam'd* with the *Holy Spirit of God*: They muſt be called *Enthuſiaſts*, *Unintelligible*, *Men of Cant of Banter*. And here I leave the Biſhop, upon this Paragraph, deſiring him to Conſider, whether his Knowledge of God

the Father, and Jesus Christ, *whom rightly to know is Life Eternal*, John 17. be by the *Revelation* of the Son of God in his own Soul, since Christ himself Teacheth and Affirmeth, that *no Man knows the Father but the Son, and He to whom the Son Reveals Him:* I should be glad to see the Bishop's Evidence for this Knowledge. For in the Conclusion of this Paragraph, he turns us to the Scriptures, who, in the beginning of it, makes us *Unintelligible* and *Banterers* in Religion, for Expressing Ours in the *Terms of It*; which may well merit the Bishop's Serious Reflection.

His *Ninth Paragraph* refers to our *Eighth* Article, as he calls it, of which he cites these Eight Words only, *Worship under the Gospel is Inward and Spiritual*; upon which, he says, *If you mean, that Outward Worship ought to be performed with Inward and Spiritual Worship, 'tis what we Preach, Press and Practice; but if* (as it would seem) *you mean that all the Worship, God now requires, is from the Inward Man, or from the Spirit; this is abominable false; for our Bodies are God's Handy-work, and God by the Apostle commands,* Glorifie God in your Body, and in your Spirit, which are God's. *Not to tell you, that you your selves, now a-days, perform somewhat of Bodily Worship.* Indeed we do, and Ever did, and Ever shall, I hope, while we have Bodies to Worship God in. We are so

far

far from denying the Body what ſhare is due to it, that with the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 6. 19. we ſay, *What, know ye not that your Bodies is the Temple of the Holy Ghoſt, which is in you, which ye have of God, and you are not your own?* Of which I would have the Biſhop well Conſider: For, if our very Bodies are under the *Influence* of the Holy Ghoſt, how much more reaſonable is it to believe, that It dwells in our Souls, and that our Hearts muſt be *Prepared*, and *Animated* by the Holy Spirit, in all our Devotion towards God. But two things I muſt Remark to the Biſhop, Firſt, That we did not give him the leaſt Occaſion to ſuſpect we deny'd Bodily Worſhip, as appears by the *Goſpel-Truth* now in queſtion: For 'tis plain there, by theſe words, *Worſhip in this day is Inward and Spiritual*, That we only diſtinguiſh'd between *Goſpel* Worſhip, and the *Ceremonial*, and *Pompous* Worſhip of the *Law*; and that by *Spiritual* Worſhip, we underſtand *Praying*, *Praiſing*, and *Preaching* by the *Preparation* and *Sanctification* of the *Spirit* of God; which the Biſhop does not, and, I hope, dares not, Deny: Yet Unkindly, and I think *Unjuſtly* brings in His, *as it would ſeem*, to make us by an Uncharitable *Innuendo* look to his Reader, as if we denied *Bodily Worſhip*. And yet, to avoid ſo hard a Chapter, as Maintaining this Aſperſion would prove to the Biſhop, he is forced to confeſs that *now a-days we perform*

perform ſomewhat of Bodily Worſhip; as if we did not perform *any* formerly, and but a little now: Which ſhews not that Candor, that his Character owes us, and but too plainly tells every Impartial Reader, how much more mind he has that we ſhould be in the *Wrong* than in he Right. I muſt Confeſs we have *leſs* Pomp and Gaudineſs in our *Worſhip*, as well as in our Cloaths, than is the Cuſtom of ſome other Churches, and think it our Happineſs that we are freed from ſuch an *Unprofitable* as well as Unſuitable Incumberance. Whatever It be, 'tis ſuch as we believe God by his Holy Spirit hath led us into: And tho' it be not ſo Entertaining to thoſe who are Govern'd more by their *outward Senſes* than their Souls, yet, I hope it will be allowed us to be *Grave*, *Solemn* and *Fervent*.

The other Remark I make upon the Biſhop's Exceptions is this, That the Spiritual Worſhip he there allows of, ſeems to be but the Worſhip of *Man's Spirit*, and not of the Spirit of God, working upon the Spirit of Man. I would not Imitate him, leſt I ſhould be Uncharitable too: For if my Reader can make more of it, he has my Conſent; but that ſeems to me to be the Biſhop's Interpretation upon Chriſt's words cited by us on this Occaſion, *viz. God will be Worſhipped in Spirit and in Truth:* Though there is a Truth in that alſo, yet this not being ſo *peculiar* to

the

the Gospel Dispensation, could not be the *Extent* of Christ's words, whose Drift certainly was, to draw Mens Minds to a more *Inward* and *Spiritual Worship*: Not only to have *less* Ceremony than was Practis'd among the *Jews*, but to *feel more of the Power and Spirit of God in our Adoration and Praises*, than belong'd to the Former Dispensation; and, with which, I heartily wish the Bishop a *better Acquaintance*. Upon the whole Matter, I am apt to think my Reader believes with me, he might as well have spared his Pains upon us, about the first Part of this *Gospel-Truth*, as he is Silent of the latter, viz. *That we may Preach in Power, as well as Words, and as God Promised, and Christ Ordained*, **without Money, and without Price.**

The Bishop, in his Tenth Paragraph, is pleased to Endeavour to lessen the Authority and Credit of our *Ninth Gospel-Truth*, relating to the *vain Fashions and Customs of the World*. His words are these. *You tell us of denying all the vain Customs and Fashions of the World, as also Excess in all things; I know of no sort of Christians who teach otherwise: I wish I knew none (even of your selves) that practis'd otherwise; it is one part of our Catechism we teach our Children.* He first Concurs with our Doctrine, for he says, *he knows none that Preaches otherwise*; and that they do the like in their Catechism. So far then he allows us

to

to be found. But he wiſhes he *knew none (even of Us) that Practice otherwiſe.* This is a ſort of Charge, and being not Prov'd, looks like a Calumny. Some perhaps do not walk quite ſo ſtrictly as becomes them to their Profeſſion; but are they own'd by us therein? Or Indulged it ſelf? If not, what are we to Conclude but that the Biſhop's Inſinuation is to *Ballance* Accounts with us for the failures of his own People? But, pray, are our Exceſſes *equal*, or the *Numbers*, that in Proportion do tranſgreſs? I would not have him Comfort himſelf with his Uncharitableneſs to his honeſt and friendly Neighbours: As it will not Excuſe his leſs exact Friends, that any of ours live larger than they profeſs, ſo it cannot juſtly affect our Body, where ſo few are faulty, when 'tis ſo well known that ſuch are ſure to meet with due Reproof.

But he adds, that *There are many Innocent and Laudable Cuſtoms, We call Vain:* This is all in a Heap, and a Reflection by Whole-Sale. I can truly tell him, I know of none; and if he had been more particular, ſo would I too: Perhaps he thought Generals *beſt* to make his Reflection *Safe:* But if it were my place to be Plaintiff, I could treat the Biſhop with a large Catalogue of very Offenſive Cuſtoms, that would concern him to think upon. However, he is pleaſed to be particular

cular upon us in one of them, which almoſt turns his Stomack, he ſays, to think of, *viz.* *Would it not make a Man's Stomach turn, to hear one forbear, in point of* Conſcience, *ſaying* [you] *to a ſingle Perſon, becauſe it is Improper; and at the ſame time, while he is ſpeaking to his Superiour, becouſe* Thou doſt *ſounds a little rudely, to ſoften the Thou, and ſay* Thee doeſt. *which is commonly your Peoples Practice.* It is pity the Biſhop could find nothing elſe to obſerve from us, that might have better edified us and his Readers: Yet if this be that, among the Laudable Cuſtoms which we call Vain, which is moſt Offenſive to his Stomach, it ſhews him to have a very *weak* one. However, a weak Stomack is better than a weak Head, and ſuch a one I ſhould take mine to be, if my Inſtances were no more to the Purpoſe and my Readers Inſtruction.

But I have ſomewhat to ſay to the Biſhop, before I leave him, upon the *Old* Topick of *Sincerity* and *Charity*, in this Reflection, as I have had in moſt of the other, *viz.* That he makes the *Ground* of our Conſcientiouſneſs, about the ſaying of *You* to a ſingle Perſon, to be only *Propriety* of Speech; which he (I was going to ſay) in his Conſcience muſt know is not ſo: But that the true Reaſon of it is, firſt, That It is the Language of the *Scriptures of Truth*; and next, that the Original of *You* to a ſingle Perſon, was *Pride* and *Flattery*, being

being a *Plural* Honour to a *Single Person*; given first to *Potentates*, and then gradually to all Subordinate Ranks of People. In Ancient and Unmixt Tongues, **Thou** to a Single Person is kept still, as also among the Common People of the present Languages, and particularly in *that Kingdom* where he is a Bishop. I refer him to a Book entituled, *No Cross No Crown*, where he will find other Reasons for our Tenderness in that Matter then he alledges, or we have Room for here; though the Bishop confines us to *Propriety* as the *only* Reason of our Practice, that he might the better Lash us with the Impropriety of *Thee* for *Thou*; which yet he might have spared, since nothing is more common with all People, than to take the like Freedom in Speech, in Cases as well at Tenses; not excepting the *Learned* themselves. But be it so, we keep *Numbers*, and intend not clipping of Cases, and that's Our Point, though not the Bishop's, it seems; which it should have been, would he have been just to us upon the Question. As for the *Levity* and *Scorn*, with which he is pleased to treat us upon this Head, I shall only say, it unbecame him, and Confirms us more than it Exposes us, whatever it does Him.

But I confess, I am surprised, to find a Man of his Character, and Pretensions, propose so loose a Question as that with which he closes this

this Paragraph: viz. *Will you ever be able to prove, the Primitive Christians used a Dialect or Dress, different from other of their Nation or Quality, and placed Religion in it? Does not Christ require Saluting those that Salute not us? And no doubt, He, and His Apostles Salutations were in the Common Form.* Doubtless, *we are able*, most easily and fully: And 'tis admirable to conceive how he could be Ignorant of these Proofs, who ought to be so well read in *Scripture* and *Antiquity*. *I beseech you therefore Brethren*, says the Apostle, *by the Mercies of God, that you present your Bodies a Living Sacrifice, Holy, Acceptable unto God, which is your Reasonable Service:* **And be not Conformed to this World**, *but be ye* **Transformed** *by the Renewing of your Minds*, Rom. 12. 1, 2. Again, the Apostle *Peter*, Chap. 1. 13, 14. *Exhorts the* Believers, *to Gird up the Loyns of their Minds, and be Sober, as Obedient Children, not* **Fashioning** *themselves, according to the former Lusts in their Ignorance*; which was the *Custom* of their Country. And Chap. 3. 3, 4. *Whose Adorning let it not be that of* **Plaiting the Hair**, *and of* **Wearing of Gold**, *or of* **Putting on of Apparel**: But *let it be the* **Hidden Man of the Heart**, *in that which is not Corruptible, even the Ornament of a* Meek and Quiet *Spirit, which is in the sight of God, of great Price.* Thus the Apostalical Counsel to the Churches. But for all this, the Bishop of *Cork* cannot

tell

tell how to think *We are able to prove, that the Primitive Christians differed in their Dress, from other People of their Country and Quality.* Nor was this only the Strictness of that Time; for the same Apostle adds, *Verse* 4. as an Argument to Enforce his Advice; for, *After this manner*, says he, *in the Old time, the Holy Women also, who trusted in God,* **Adorned themselves.** But can a Man of his Letters, really be at a Loss for a Proof of the *Singularity* of Primitive Christians, in *Dress, Speech* and *Behaviour*? Or is it to try if we have any to resolve his Question? Or taking our Illiterature for Granted, that he puts upon us? I beseech him to Converse with *Ouzelius* upon *Minutius Fælix*, and he will tell him that the first Christians were tax'd, and despised for **Ill-bred** in *Manners*, **Unpolish'd** in *Speech*, **Unfashionable** in *Behaviour*; in fine, **Rusticks** and **Clowns**: As the Christians *Irronically* return'd their *Scorners* the Stile of *Well-bred* and *Eloquent*. This, and much more he cites out of *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Theodoret*, &c. And *Jerom* writing to *Celantia* and *Demetias*, Noble Women of that time, sets them a *Singular* Form of Life from that of the People of their Quality: And *Paulinus* Bishop of *Nola*, was so far from pleading for Christians *Temporizing* with the People of their own Nation, or Quality, according to the Bishop of *Cork*, that he sharp-

ly

ly reproves *Sulpitius Severus* for It, in a letter to him; as the learned *Casoubon*, in his Discourse of *Use* and *Customs*, observes. If the Bishop would look into the *Constitutions*, that go under the name of *Clemens Romanus*, with *Tertullian*, *Gregory Naz.* *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Austin*, *Gregory* the Great, and other Ancients, he would perceive the Care and Zeal of those Eminent Men to suppress the *Education* and *Customs* of the Gentiles, and to encourage and recommend the *Simplicity* and *Moderation* of the Manners and Behaviour of the first Christians, which *Machiavel* in his 2*d* Book of *Disputations* takes notice of, and is none of the least proofs to our Point.

And to finish my Authorities, passing by *Petrus Belonius*, *Gratian*, *Cardan*, *Luther*, &c. I must recommend to the Bishop the History of the *Waldenses* (an Early People, if not *Successive* from the Primitive Times) written by one *Perrin*, more especially containing their *Faith*, *Worship* and *Discipline*; and there he may, if he please, observe the *Simplicity*, *Plainness* and *Distinction* of that People from the Customs of the Countries they lived in, and those that have the name of *Reformed* ones now.

But he tells us, *Christ and his Apostles had Salutations*; and I tell him, so have We. But he will have it that Christ and his Apostles *Saluted after the Fashion of the Country*

they were in; which is sooner said then prov'd. For Christ asked the Jews, *How can you believe that receive Honour one of another, and seek not the Honour that cometh from God* **Only**? Now this certainly must be Unlawful to Give or Receive, which *hinders* true Faith. And what was this Honour, but *Salutations* after the Fashion of the Times? As the Text shews, *Matth.* 23. and for *Calling, and being Called of Men Rabbi*, Christ was so far from Commanding, or Imitating them in such things, that He expresly *forbids it*. But the meaning of Christ's saying, *Mat.* 5. *And if ye Salute Your Brethren only, what do ye more than Others? Do not even the Publicans so?* Is this; That in all Acts of *Love*, *Mercy* and *Goodness* they were to *Exceed* the Practice of that time: They were to take more notice of, and to look *more kindly* and *friendly* upon All Men. But in another sense, He that bid them *Salute Enemies as well as Friends*, also forbids his Disciples to *Salute any Man*, or *call any Man Rabbi or Master*; *for that One was their Lord and Master, and they were all Brethren*, *Matth.* 23. 6, 7, 8. and *Luke* 10. 4. And between such Relations Worldly Honours were of no use, as well as of no value. And did a *Primitive Spirit Prevail* in those that so much pretend to be the *Successors* of the Apostles, we should see them more *Exemplary* in *Self-denial* and *Holiness*; Encouraging

raging, and not *Undervaluing* and *Brow-beating* the Serious and Conſcientious, But *Trees are known by their Fruit ; for Grapes are not gathered of Thorns, nor Figs of Thiſtles.*

In the mean time, if my Reader pleaſe to peruſe the Ninth and Tenth Chapters of that Book Entituled, *No Croſs, No Crown*, he will, I hope be ſatisfied, that we are for *Honour, Reſpect* and *Civility* according to *Scripture* ; tho *Non-conformiſts* to the *Empty* and *Troubleſome* Ceremonies of the *Times*, left by us, not of Rudeneſs, but *Conviction* ; and forbore of Duty and no otherwiſe of Choice. For, Humanely Speaking, that Contradiction to Cuſtom cannot be Pleaſant to us. I have detained my Reader longer upon this Head than I expected, or perhaps he deſired: I ſhall therefore proceed to the Biſhop's next Paragraph, which contains his Exceptions to our Tenth *Goſpel-Truth* about *Baptiſm* and the *Supper*, and the laſt he has to take notice of, the Eleventh, about *Government*, being by him already granted in the beginning of his Paper.

He begins thus, *In your Xth Article you believe a Spiritual Baptiſm and a Spiritual Supper and Communion, but acknowledge, you diſ-uſe the outward Signs, by us commonly called Sacraments: Now did not Chriſt command Water-Baptiſm?* Go ye and Baptize all Nations, *Matth.* 28. 19, 20.

He goes on, *The Baptiſm here commanded, was Water-Baptiſm:* His reaſons are firſt, *that Baptizing with the Spirit was God's Work, not the Apoſtles.* 2dly, *Primitive Practice, Acts* 10. 47, 48. in *Cornelius*'s Caſe; *Who can forbid Water?* But this is alſo *gratis dictum:* For the firſt Reaſon is no Reaſon, ſince it is *not true:* And the ſecond ſeems to me *Defective* and *Short.* I am very ſenſible of the *Diſadvantage* I am under, and that I touch a *tender* Place, and what I ſay upon this Head, as alſo anon upon the *Supper*, will be againſt *Wind* and *Tide* with the Generality. But as I hope I ſhall expreſs my ſelf *Reverently* as well as Plainly upon this Occaſion, ſo I beſeech my *Reader*, for His Own ſake as well as Ours, not to *Prejudge* us; as I am ſure he will not if he be a *Searcher* after Truth, and that I charitably ſuppoſe of him.

I ſay then the Biſhop's firſt Reaſon is not true; for God by the Apoſtles did Baptize Believers with the *Holy Ghoſt.* It fell upon them, through the Powerful Preaching of the Word: Thus, *Acts* 10. 44. *While* Peter *yet ſpoke theſe words, the Holy Ghoſt fell on all them which heard the Word.* By which it is evident that *Peter*, in that Sermon, was the Miniſter of the *Spiritual Baptiſm* to *Cornelius* and his Company.

And

And *Peter* gives this account to those of the *Circumcision* at *Jerusalem*, Acts 11. 15. *And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on* them *as on* us *at the beginning: Then remembred I the Word of the Lord, how that he said* John *indeed Baptized with Water, but ye shall be Baptized with the Holy Spirit.* So that *Peter* evidently declares the Gift of the Spirit by the Ministry of the Gospel, to be the Baptism of Christ, or the Baptism of the Holy Spirit and Fire, which Christ promised at his *Ascension* into Heaven.

But the Apostle *Paul* puts this Matter beyond all Doubt, in his Excellent Account he gives of his *Conversion* and *Commission* to King *Agrippa*, Acts 26. where my *Reader* will find these words dropping from the Mouth of the *Lord Jesus* to *Saul*; *Delivering thee from the People, and from the Gentiles, to whom now I send thee, to* **open their Eyes**, *and to turn them from* **Darkness** *to* **Light**, *and from the* **Power** *of Satan unto* **God**, *that they may receive Forgiveness of Sins, and an Inheritance among them which are Sanctified through Faith that is in Me*, Verse 17, 18. Now if this could be done *without* the Holy Ghost, let my Reader judge. 'Twas with the *Holy Ghost* that *Peter*'s Hearers were *Prick'd to the Heart*, and fitted to receive more of It: And it was by the *same* Holy Ghost that *Paul*'s Hearers had the *Eyes of their Minds opened*, to see the *Mysteries* of

God's Kingdom, and by which they were *Converted from Darkneſs to Light*, that they might receive the Forgiveneſs of their Sins, and Inheritance among them which are Sanctified. So that the very End and Benefit of the Apoſtolical Miniſtry was *Converting*, that is, *Baptizing them into Chriſtianity*; in the Nature, Power and Life of It, by the *Holy Ghoſt*.

Now for the Biſhop's Second Reaſon, viz. *Practice*: I ſay it is granted that Water-Baptiſm having got place among them by *John*'s Miniſtry, the Fore-runner, it held after Chriſt's Coming; but that was *Ex Gatia*, and of *Condeſcention*, not of Commiſſion; for that properly ceaſes when his Miniſtration begins, of which *John*'s was but the *Fore-runner*. For *Moſes* and the *Prophets were till* John, *and* John *till Chriſt*. And this, *John* the Water-Baptiſt tells us, *Matth.* 3. 11. *I indeed Baptize you with* Water *unto Repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, He ſhall Baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt and with Fire*, ſee *Mark* 1. 8. *Luke* 3. 16. Here's a different Baptiſm and Baptizer, the *Servant* and the *Maſter*, the *Water* and the *Holy Ghoſt*. One *Tranſcient*, the Other *Permanent*: One the *End* of the Jewiſh, and the Other the *Beginning* of the Goſpel Diſpenſation. Wherefore ſays our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, *The leaſt in the Kingdom of Heaven is Greater*

than

than John, *Matth.* 11. 11. Why, is not *John* in Heaven? No doubt of it at all, and a Glorious Saint to: But the *Least* in Christ's Dispensation, *viz. The Kingdom of God in the Soul*, the *Work* of Christ, the Baptizer with the *Holy Ghost* and *Fire*, is *Greater* than *John*, as to the *Nature* of his Administration. See *John* 3. 30, 31. *He must Increase, but I must Decrease.* What! *John* decrease, or his Ministration? His Ministration certainly, which he calls *Earthly* in Comparison of Christ's. So that the Baptist in his *Watery* Dispensation did but *Fore-run* Christ, in reference to the Kingdom that he was to set up in Men. He pointed to Christ, and shewed what Christ was to do, *viz.* to *Wash*, *Fan*, and *Throughly Purge his Floor*; that is, His *People*, and Sanctifie them *throughout*, *by his Spiritual Baptism*, according to the Apostle, *in Body, Soul and Spirit*, 1 Thess. 5. 23. So that in short, *Practice* Properly can be no *Institution*, where the thing Practised has *no Commission*, which I suppose the Bishop will not think fit to deny: But, says he, *It has a Commission*, Matth. 28. 19. which is, under favour, but his *say so*; and that I think it is no more, I do with all Humility and Submission say, First, I cannot tell how to reconcile it to Good Sense, or Common Usage in Sacred or Civil Matters, that any thing should be in force by a Commission that is not so much as *once*

named in the Commiſſion. I ſay, to me it does not appear *Congruous* any more than *Cogent*, or obliging. And this is the Cauſe in hand: For there is not a word of *Water* in the Text alledged for Water; nor yet in the Context. And unleſs there were *no other* Baptiſm than that of *Water*, as there are ſeveral, it muſt at leaſt be allowed to be a *Queſtion*, what Baptiſm Chriſt meant in that Commiſſion, when he ſaid, *Go ye therefore and Teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt.*

But it may be returned upon me; nor does the Text ſay it is the Baptiſm of the *Holy Ghoſt*, and ſo the Biſhop is upon equal Terms with me. Grant it, that the word *Holy Ghoſt* is not litterally joyned to *Baptizing*, any more than the word *Water* in that part: But if I am able to ſhew that the thing is there, and that the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt was the *Subject* of Chriſt's Diſcourſe, when he gave that Commiſſion at his Farewell, I preſume it will be granted me, that Chriſt intended a *Spiritual*, and not a *Water* Baptiſm; and that is what I ſhall do, I hope with much Clearneſs. Firſt, the Fact, and then my Arguments. *Matthew*, the Evangeliſt, large in his Hiſtory upon other Points, ſeems ſhort and abrupt in the Context of this Commiſſion, as the Reader may obſerve. And as it is uſual for one

Evangeliſt

Evangeliſt to explain another, which was the great Wiſdom, as well as Goodneſs of God, that thoſe Chriſtian Memorials might come with leſs Suſpition to the World of any Humane Contrivance; So *Luke* ſupplies the ſhortneſs of the other Evangeliſt in his Context to this Commiſſion. *Luke* 24. 45. to 50. particularly the 47, 48, 49. verſes. And *that Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins ſhould be Preached in his Name, among all Nations, beginning at* Jeruſalem. *And ye are* Witneſſes *of theſe things. And behold I ſend the* Promiſe *of my Father upon you: But tarry ye in the City of* Jeruſalem *until ye be endued with Power from on High.* Where, as it is plain that this Evangeliſt in his Account of Chriſt's Commiſſion, to wit, *the Work Chriſt gave his Diſciples to do*, Names no *Baptizing* at all, tho that which it *Implies*, in my Senſe of the Word, is there, *viz. the Promiſe of the Father*, which is the Power from on High They *were to tarry at* Jeruſalem *for*. So is there not *one Word* of Water here mentioned, to induce us to think that Chriſt intended to give it *any Place* in his Commiſſion. In ſhort, it appears that the Diſciples were to be *Qualified* before they were to go forth as His *Witneſſes*, and that this Qualification is the *Promiſe of the Father*, that he would quickly ſend them. Now I muſt deſire my Reader to turn to the *Acts* of this Evangeliſt,

liſt, Chap. 1. 4, 5. where he further opens the Manner and Matter of Chriſt's Diſcourſe, and *Farewell* to his Diſciples: And (Chriſt) *being Aſſembled with them, commanded them, that they ſhould not depart from* Jeruſalem, *but* Wait *for the* Promiſe *of the Father, which,* ſaith He, *ye have learnt of me: For* John *truly Baptized with* Water, *but ye ſhall be Baptized with the Holy Ghoſt not many days hence.* It can be, methinks, no longer a doubt what Baptiſm it is that Chriſt's words, *Matth.* 28. 19. referrs to, ſince we ſee not only that Chriſt diſtinguiſhes between *John*'s Baptiſm and His Own, and between *Water* and *Holy Ghoſt*; but alſo he aſſigns Water-Baptiſm to *John*, as *his Baptiſm*, and not Chriſt's, and thereby declares the *Holy Ghoſt* to be his own Baptiſm, and none of *John*'s, and which yet is no more than what *John* had ſaid before.

So that Comparing both Texts together, *Matth.* 28. 19. and *Acts* 1. 4. 5. we may ſee, if we pleaſe, that the *Commiſſion* in the one, is to be explained by the *Qualifications* in the other, which was omitted by the firſt Evangeliſt. There They are bid to *Go*, here They are bid to *Stay*: That is to ſay, Stay, before you Go, and receive your *Qualifications* before you go to *Qualify*, viz. *the* Promiſe *of the Father*; that is, the *Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt*, which is followed *by the Power from* On High, verſe 8. And indeed, had we not this expreſs

force

force on our ſide from the Text it ſelf, the Word *Therefore* in the Commiſſion, (referring plainly to the foregoing Verſe, as the Reaſon of what follows) juſtifies our ſenſe. For whereas the Biſhop has objected againſt our Aſſertion, *that it muſt not be a Spiritual Baptiſm, becauſe that was the Work of God, and not of the Apoſtles:* It is plain that our Lord takes off the force of his exception, ſince the Reaſon why he bid them *Go*, &c. is *becauſe*, ſays he, *all Power in Heaven and in Earth is given unto me.* Verſe 18. as much as if he had ſaid, *Go, do all that I have ſaid unto you, and be not* **Doubting** *or* **Fearful**, *about the performance of It*, for **All Power** *in Heaven and Earth is given unto me* that bids you Go, *and Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World*, Which need not have been ſaid, as an Encouragement to them, in referrence to Water-*Baptiſm*, ſince that was practiſed by them, as well as by *John*'s Diſciples long before.

Nor is this all; for the very Text, duely conſidered, will not have It to be Water, ſince that could Baptize none *Into* the Name of the *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghoſt*, and ſo the Biſhop knows the Greek Text runs, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα. for they that are Baptized *Into* the Name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghoſt*, muſt be Baptized with the Baptiſm of the *Holy Ghoſt*. Since it is to become their

Likeneſs,

Likeneſs, and bear their *Image*, which is *Holineſs*. And had not the Apoſtles underſtood their Commiſſion as I render it, when they had Baptized with Water, they would certainly have uſed the Terms that bore the Force of their Commiſſion, *viz. in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*; of which there is not one Inſtance in all the Scripture.

But that which further ſhews that *Water* cannot be underſtood, to be meant in the Apoſtolical Commiſſion, is, that one of the Greateſt of the Apoſtles, He that came behind (and was added to, by) none of them, denies It, 1 *Cor.* 1. 27. to be *any Part of his Commiſſion*; for, ſays he, *Chriſt ſent me not to Baptize but to Preach the Goſpel*: And thanks God for that reaſon, in the fore-going Verſes, that he had Baptized ſo few: Which to be ſure he ought not to have done; but on the Contrary to have been ſorry he had Baptized *no more*, had *Water-Baptiſm* been *Part* of the Apoſtolical Commiſſion, *Matth.* 28 19. Again this Eminent Apoſtle, the *Great Grand-Father* [not to ſay *God-Father*] of Gentile-Chriſtians, delivered to them *for Doctrine*, Eph. 4. 5. that there was but *One Lord, One Faith, and One Baptiſm.* And if ſo, *That* muſt be the Baptiſm *of Fire and of the Holy Ghoſt*, which is Chriſt's Baptiſm, and *Proper*

to

to the Gospel Dispensation. Now could any other make a Man a *True Christian*, or a *Child of God* then; nor can any be so now without It. That Baptism therefore, without which a Man cannot be a *True Jew*, or *Christian*, or of the *Circumcision made without hands, that Worship God in the Spirit, and hath no Confidence in the Flesh*, must need be the *One Baptism*; but such is the Baptism of the *Holy Ghost:* Therefore the *Spiritual* Baptism is the Apostles *One Baptism*, Rom. 2. 28, 29. Phil. 3. 3. Again; the one Baptism must be Christ's Baptism, but Christ is the Baptism of the *Spirit*, therefore *That*, and not *Water*-Baptism, must be the One Baptism that's in force, according to the Apostle. As *John* was the *Fore-runner* of Christ, so was *Water*, of the *Holy Ghost:* But that which Foreruns, in Nature *Ceases*, and that which succeeds, of course *Remains:* Therefore the Baptism of the Spirit, is the *One Needful*, and *Permanent Baptism.*

Yet further; If it be Gospel, *That he is not a Jew that is one Outward, nor that Circumcision that is Outward in the Flesh; but that he is a Jew that is one* Inward, *and that is Circumcision that is of the Heart, in the* Spirit, *and not in the* Letter; *whose Praise is not of Men, but of God*, as Rom. 2. 28, 29. Then unanswerably, *He is not a Christian that is one Outward, nor is that Baptism*

tism that is of the Flesh: But he is a Christian *that is one Inwardly, and that is Baptism that is* **of the Heart**, in the Spirit; *whose Praise is not of Men but of God.* For indeed in all Ages Men cry him down, as a *Slighter* of God's Ordinances; but his Praise however is *of God*, let Men say what they will; and this is the Inward Christians Comfort, in all Undervaluings and Reflections he meets with from Outside Christians. For it's not to be thought that the Apostle meant or designed to undervalue one Observation, as that of Circumcision, because it is Outward, and set up another Outward Observation *instead* of it, viz. *Water-Baptism.*

Again, *If in Christ Jesus, neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but a* **New Creature**, as saith the same Apostle, *Gal.* 6. 15. Then by the same Reason, *neither being baptized with Water availeth any thing*, nor being *unbaptized with Water*, but a **New Creature**. I will repeat the Apostles Discourse at large upon this Subject, in the same Chapter, because it is very Instructing, and seems Discissive in this Case; *As many*, says he, *as desire to make a fair shew in the* **Flesh**, *they constrain you to be Circumcised; only least they should suffer Persecution for the Cross of Christ.* It seems they were Outside People, that laid stress upon Outside things; or something else instead of the Cross of Christ; for they Tem-

porized

porized in this matter, to ſhun the Shame and Perſecution that then attended the Chriſtians Croſs: Which ſtood partly in laying down of outward Obſervations; and which they that *deſire to make a fair ſhew in the Fleſh* ſtand moſt for. But the Apoſtle goes on; *For* (ſays he) *neither they themſelves who are Circumciſed keep the Law, but deſire to have you Circumciſed, that they may Glory in your Fleſh.* They were not exact in the other parts of the Law, it ſeems, as ſtrict as they ſeemed to be for this Sacramental Practice, which is the Caſe of too many now: Yet they preſt it, that they might glory and value themſelves upon gaining others to be conformable to them, whether to excuſe their Compliance with Cuſtom, that they might avoid Perſecution, or out of love to Ceremonial Religion.

But ſays that clear-ſighted and plain-dealing Apoſtle, *God forbid that I ſhould Glory, ſave in the Croſs of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, whereby the World is Crucified unto me, and I unto the World.* If he rejoyced in nothing but in the *Croſs* of Chriſt, then in no *other* Elementary Rite, Service or Ordinance, any more than in Circumciſion.

But he proceeds: *For in Chriſt Jeſus, neither Circumciſion availeth any thing, nor Uncircumciſion*, but a **New Creature**. That is to ſay, for according to Chriſt Jeſus, or in the Religion

Religion of Christ Jesus, neither Circumcision nor Uncircumcision availeth, *but a New Creature, a Regenerate Soul; One born again by the Spirit of God:* For the Apostle in these excellent Words, not only strikes at Circumcision, but all Outward and Elementary Observations: Neither This, nor That *Outward thing availeth in the Christian Religion*, or according to *Christ Jesus*, but a *New Creature*: He does not say, *but Water-Baptism*, as some would have it, who tell us that It *succeeds* Circumcision by *Divine* Institution, by no means: But that which availeth with Christ, and in the Religion of Christ Jesus, is *a New Creature, a New Man*, one *Changed, Regenerated*, or *Born again by the Word and Baptism of the Holy Ghost*. And says the Apostle (to confirm them in this Doctrine of *Inward* Circumcision, that is of the *Heart*, in the *Spirit*; which is the *same* thing with the Baptism of the Spirit) *As many as walk according to this Rule, Peace shall be upon them.* So that We the poor despised *Quakers*, take Comfort in this Apostolical Benediction, and can say, to God's Glory, his *Peace has been upon Us* in our Belief and Confession of his blessed Doctrine of the *New Creature.* It is what we have *Aimed* at, and has been the great *Drift* of our Testimony since we were a People; and in order to it have directed all to the Gift of God's *Grace in themselves*, that by believing

in

in it, and resigning up their Wills and Affections, and whole Man to the Teaching and Conduct of it, they may be leavened and sanctified by it, *throughout*; by which the State of the *New Creature*, which is Christianity indeed, will be *Experienced*, tho' it was and is a Mystery to the World.

As for the Apostle *Peter*'s Question, *Acts* 10. 47, 48. *Can any Man forbid Water, that These should not be Baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as We?* It Imports with submission, no more than this; That *Peter* well knowing the Narrowness of his Country-Mens Spirits, was Cautious lest his Latitude should Distaste them: For the *Gentiles* being *Unholiness* to the *Jews*, and even *Peter* himself without a Vision from God, too narrow Spirited for the Convictions and Devotion of that excellent Centurion, *Cornelius*; It behoved him to ask if any Body had any thing to say, Why they might not be Baptized as well as the *Jews*, being Proselytes to the Christian Profession. In all which he seems more concerned to save his *Own* Credit, than to recommend or establish that of Water Baptism: As if he had said, Why should this Custom be forbid to the *Gentiles* more than the *Jews?* But this will not warrant the Practice in General, because Practice is *no Institution*, and that there appears no Command to make it one. So that asking

who can forbid what was not commanded, ſtrengthens his Queſtion, inſtead of weakening it; ſince what was done of *Condeſcention*, could not have been forbid upon Authority. There needed not ſo much Care or Strickneſs in the Matter. And indeed, the Apoſtles themſelves ſeem not to have been ſo clear about the aboliſhing of the Jewiſh Obſervations, as appears by the want *Peter* had of a Viſion, his own apprehenſion of the ſtraightneſs of his *Brethren*, and their calling him to Account for what he had done, as may be ſeen in the ſame Chapter.

But I confeſs I cannot ſee why the Biſhop ſhould aſſume the Power of Unchriſtianing Us, for not practiſing of that which he himſelf practices ſo *unſcripturally*, and that according to the Sentiments of a conſiderable part of *Chriſtendom*; having not one Text of Scripture to prove that *Sprinkling* of Water in the Face, was the Water Baptiſm, or that *Children* were the *Subjects* of Water Baptiſm, in the firſt times. And yet this is all the Baptiſm the Biſhop practices, who ſeems ſo ſevere upon us. I think our forbearing of Water-Baptiſm from a Belief and Senſe of the coming of the Inviſible Grace, ſignified by that Viſible Sign, cannot be reputed ſuch a ſlight to Water Baptiſm, as preſuming to *alter* the Manner and Subſtance of its firſt Inſtitution: For then it was in the River of *Jordan*, now

now in a *Baſon*; it was then unto *Repentance*, now to *Children Uncapable* of Repentance. But that which perhaps miſled the Doctors of the *Declining* Church firſt into this Practice, being at the diſtance of ſome Hundreds of Years from the Apoſtolical Times, might be the ſuppoſition that Water Baptiſm came in the place of Circumciſion, and that being to Children, ſo might Water Baptiſm too. But they forgot (among other things, which even before that time were crept into the Church, without Precept or Evangelical Example) that Repentance was not made a Condition to Circumciſion, as it was to Water Baptiſm. I would beſeech the Biſhop to tread ſoftly in this Matter; for if Water Baptiſm ſhould indeed prove a *Badge* of Chriſtianity, he would be at a loſs for one that would paſs currant in Scripture. Thus much for this Point.

What I have ſaid upon this Head of *Water Baptiſm* may ſerve alſo for what is commonly called the *Lord's Supper*, which the *Biſhop* Reproves us for Omitting to Practice: Urging *Luke* 22. 19. *This do in Remembrance of me.* And the Apoſtles words, 1 *Cor.* 11. 24, 25. It is true indeed Chriſt ſaid, when he eat it with his Diſciples, *That they ſhould do it in remembrance of him till he came.* And this ſeems much more of the Nature of a Commiſſion than that cited by the Biſhop for Water

Baptiſm: But the *Limitation* Chriſt gives to the Practice of it, and a Right and Proper Conſideration of the *Import* of his words, and the *Nature* of the thing will beſt lead us to underſtand his Mind therein.

1*ſt*, This was alſo a *Jewiſh Practice*, as well as *Water Baptiſm*, and ſo in *Nature* of no Goſpel Inſtitution, but *Temporary* in its uſe.

2*dly*, Chriſt ſeems by this to break or open to them what was ſo hard for them to bear, to wit, his *Departure* and *Death*, by a Token of Memorial till he ſhould come to them again.

3*dly*, Chriſt takes occaſion from thence to ſhew forth to his Diſciples the *Myſtical Supper* they ſhould eat, and the Fellowſhip they ſhould have with him when he came again.

Now we believe this Coming was *Spiritual*, ſuitable to that ſaying of his, *I will drink no more of This Fruit of the Vine till I drink it New with you in the Kingdom of my Father: And ſome here ſhall not taſte of Death till they ſee the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom*, Matth. 16. 28. Again, *He that dwelleth with you ſhall be in you*, John 14. *I in them and they in me*, Chap. 17. All which plainly Imports a Spiritual Coming. Alſo *Rev.* 3. 20. *Behold I ſtand at the Door and knock, if any Man hear my Voice and open the Door, I will come into him, and will ſup*

ſup with him and he with me, which was ſaid near Forty Years after his Aſcention. Now ſince this is acknowledged to be an *Outward* Sign of an *Inward* and *Inviſible* Grace, what can *Outward* Bread and Wine more properly Signifie and Reſemble, than *Inward Bread and Wine?* And an Outward than an *Inward Supper?* And if ſo, the words may reaſonably be read thus, *Eat this Supper of Outward Bread and Wine, till I come into, and Sup with you, and be your Supper, that am the Bread and Wine from Heaven which Nouriſhes the Soul unto Eternal Life.*

4*thly*. The Kingdom of God being Spiritual and in the Soul, *ſuch* ſhould be the *Ordinances* of that Kingdom. Now Chriſt tells the Phariſees, *Luke* 17. 20. *The Kingdom of God is within.* And the Apoſtle *Paul*, Rom. 14. 17. ſaith, *The Kingdom of God is* **not Meat** *and* **Drink**, *but* **Righteouſneſs**, *and* **Peace**, *and* **Joy** *in the Holy Ghoſt:* But the outward Supper is *Meat* and *Drink*, and therefore not of the Kingdom of God which is not **Meat** and **Drink**, but **Righteouſneſs**, **Peace** and **Joy** in the *Holy Ghoſt*. And this was made Uſe of by Chriſt in the State of *Humiliation*, before his Death, and the pouring forth of the Holy Ghoſt, to faſten upon his Diſciples that were *weak*, and *of little Faith*, the Remembrance of him till they ſhould know

him with them and in them by his Spiritual Appearance (as he was the *Lord from Heaven, the Quickning Spirit*) according to his Promiſe. For if the Scripture be conſulted, we ſhall not only find that Chriſt *Reproves* the Apoſtles for their Infidelity in him, but after all the *Example*, *Precepts* and *Miracles* they ſaw by him, and that he had ſo very lately left them with ſuch Aſſurances of his Coming to them again; yet when *Mary*, &c. brought them the Tidings of his *Reſurrection*, it is ſaid, *Luke* 24. 10, 11. *Their words ſeemed to the Diciples as Idle Tales*, and they *believed them not*. Which ſufficiently ſhews the low State they were in, or that at leaſt they needed a *Sign* or Token, as that of the *Supper* to Commemorate Him. But this Reaſon, which is yet true, does not Credit its Continuation; for when the Spirit was come, or Chriſt in his Spiritual Appearance, their Eyes were opened and they ſaw then it was the *Spirit that Quickens, the Fleſh profiteth nothing*, John 6. 63.

5*thly*, Moſt certainly Chriſt meant no leſs, when he Preach'd himſelf *the Bread that came down from Heaven*, John 6. 31 to 52. and that they that would have Life Eternal, *muſt eat his Fleſh and drink his Blood:* That is, they muſt feed upon *Spiritual Food:* Not the Outward but *Inward Supper*; the thing ſignified and *Subſtance it ſelf*. For Chriſt oppoſes Himſelf,

ſelf, who is the Bread of God, to the Bread their Fathers eat in the Wilderneſs who were Dead, which was of an *Elementary* Nature; therefore it can never be that ſuch Bread as periſheth ſhould be the Bread of the *Evangelical Supper*, when Chriſt by Compariſon undervalues it to the Bread he had to give them.

6thly, Our Bleſſed Lord, *Mark* 7. 18. taught, *That it was not that which went into the Man that defileth the Man, becauſe it went but into his Body, and not into his Heart*; and if ſo, the Argument is undeniable, that it is not that which goeth into the Man, that is, into his Body, and not into his Heart, that *Sanctifieth* the Man: But Material Bread and Wine goeth only into the Body, and not into the Heart; therefore they cannot Sanctifie. The import of Chriſt's words is plainly this, *Meats and Drinks* neither Defile nor Sanctifie; they *neither Benefit nor Harm any one upon a Spiritual Account*: Conſequently *Elementary* Bread and Wine cannot be the *Evangelical* Supper, but a Figure of It, which is ended in Chriſt the Bread of God, that cometh down from Heaven, *John* 6. 31, 32, 48, 49, 50. That a Man may eat of and not dye: The Subſtance of all Shadows; for ſaith the Apoſtle, the Body is of Chriſt; and where that is, our Lord tells us, *Luke* 13. 37. the

Eagles are gathered together: Where the Apoſtles. Wiſe Men, 1 *Cor.* 10. 15. ſeek for the true Supper, which nouriſhes the Souls unto Eternal Life.

7thly. But the Biſhop will have this *Supper* four times repeated in the Scripture of the New Teſtament, beſides that of the Apoſtle *Paul*, which muſt be his miſtake——ſince there is no Command to practice it beyond that very Time, but in *Luke* 22. 19. if there it ſelf. For tho' his eating of the Paſſover is there related, as alſo in *Mark* and *Luke*, It was but once *done*; and the Command, *This do in Remembrance of me*, is only *Once Related* among the Evangeliſts, as well as it is but *Once Commanded.* And would we be ſtrict with the Biſhop, we need not allow him that Command to reach further than the preſent Time in which it was Given; for *This Do*, or *Take Eat*, are Equally in the *preſent Tence*, *for thereby you ſhew forth my Death.* And the following words, viz. *I will Drink no more of* **This** *Fruit of the Vine, until that Day when I Drink it* **New** *with you in my Fathers Kingdom*, Mat. 26. 29. further Explains it. Thus *Mark* has it, 14. 25. *Verily I ſay unto you, I will Drink no more of the Fruit of the Vine until that Day that I Drink it* **New** *in the Kingdom of God.* Luke 22. 18. gives it thus, *I ſay unto you, I will not Drink of the Fruit of the*

Vine

Vine till the Kingdom of God **ſhall come.** Now it is plain that Chriſt referrs them to the Spiritual Supper, which we Preferr and Practice, and which is the Supper *Signified* by That of outward Bread and Wine, that was to ſerve *till the Kingdom of God came*, and then he would Communicate with them in a way *Suitable* to the Kingdom: Which Kingdom, as before ſaid, is not *Meat* and *Drink*, but *Righteouſneſs*, *Peace* and *Joy* in the Holy Ghoſt. And as the ſame Apoſtle has it, 1 *Cor.* 4. 20. *The Kingdom of God is not in Word but in Power*; of which Power, and its coming from on High upon the Apoſtles, Read *Acts* 1. 6, 7, 8.

For when they asked Chriſt, *Lord wilt thou at this time Reſtore the Kingdom again to Iſrael*, and that he told them, 'twas not for them to know *the Times or the Seaſons which the Father had put into his own Power.* He alſo adds, *But ye ſhall receive Power after the Holy Ghoſt is come upon you*, and ye ſhall be *Witneſſes unto me, both in* Jeruſalem and Judea, and in Samaria, *and in the uttermoſt Parts of the Earth.* This Power was the *Kingdom* of God, *for it ſtands in Power*, ſays the Apoſtle; but it ſeems he thought fit to wave their Queſtion, as to a direct Anſwer, and left it a Secret to be revealed unto them, when the Holy Ghoſt ſhould Come, and the Power from on High ſhould fall upon them: And thus he takes his leave

leave of them, and is Immediately received by a Cloud out of their Sight.

Before I conclude with this Paragraph, I would obſerve, *Firſt*, That it was the *Paſſover* and Cuſtom of the Jews, which properly ſpeaking, we conceive hath no juſt Plea to continue as a *Goſpel Ordinance* or Inſtitution; ſince it was a Type of Him to come, and therefore ended, as to *Inſtitution* by his coming.

Secondly, That the Evangeliſt *John*, the Beloved Diſciple, that lay in the Boſom of Chriſt, does not ſo much as mention It, or *Water Baptiſm*, as left by Chriſt to be continued by his Followers. Concerning the Spirit's Baptiſm, tho' he uſes not the word Baptiſm, yet he is very full, *John* 14, 16, 17. Chapters where he tells them, that he would ſend them the *Comforter the Spirit of Truth, to lead them into all Truth, and that he would dwell with them for ever.* I ſay It ſeems very Improbable if not Incredible, that what the Biſhop ſtiles the *Badges* of Chriſtianity in his 17th Paragraph, ſhould be *wholly forgotten* by ſo great an Apoſtle of *Chriſtianity*.

3dly. And as the Beloved Diſciples ſays nothing of theſe *viſible Signs*, which the Biſhop calls the *Badges* of Chriſtianity, ſo neither are they made an *Article* of any of the *Ancient Creeds* Extant, which certainly does not make for their Credit or Authority: Since had they then been of that Importance they are

now by ſome eſteemed, we cannot think they would have been forgot by the Compilers of thoſe Creeds.

4*thly*. The Apoſtle *Paul*, though he repeats the *Tradition* he received of the Lord's Supper, that night he was betrayed, does not Injoyn it; but as often as the Corinthians did it, he tells them they ſhould do it in remembrance of Chriſt: Which is far from commanding it, as it would be for the Biſhop, if he ſhould ſay to his Friend, as often as he comes to *Cork* he ſhould come and Eat with him, obliges that Perſon to *come often* to *Cork*. So that tho' the Apoſtle bids them, that as often as they did it, they ſhould do it in *Remembrance* of Chriſt, yet he does not thereby bid them do it *often*, if at all.

5*thly*. And whereas the Biſhop would make it a freſh Revelation to the Apoſtle, when he ſays, for *I have received of the Lord, that which alſo I delivered unto you*, I muſt diſſent from him. I cannot apprehend that means any more than this, *that what account he had received of Chriſt's Eating the Supper with his Diſciples, the Night he was Betrayed, the ſame alſo he had Delivered unto them:* For what need could there be of an *Immediate Revelation* for ſo late a *Fact*, ſo well Witneſſed by the Diſciples? But if my Reader will peruſe that Part of the Chapter which relates to the Supper, he will find the Streſs lies upon

Remembring

Remembring of the Lord, which is indeed our Daily, Indiſpenſible Duty, and he that lives without it, may be ſaid to live without God in the World; of which thoſe *Corinthians* at that time ſeemed ſo Inſenſible, and as ſuch are ſeverely reproved by the Apoſtle, being *Irreverent*, *Greedy* and *Drunken*, hardly fit for the Sign, and *leſs* able to diſcern the *Thing Signified*.

6thly. Nor does the Apoſtle ſeem to recommend this practice, but rather *reprehend* their *Abuſe* of it; and if my Reader will look back to the foregoing Chapter, from the beginning to the 18th verſe, he may find a more *Spiritual* Supper, and *Myſtical* Bread and Cup hinted at by the Apoſtle, as well as *Mat.* 26. 29. *Rev.* 3. 20. by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf: Which is indeed very copiouſly expreſt by *Luke* in the Parable of the *Supper*, chap. 14. from the 16th to the 24th verſe, where One that was at Meat with Chriſt, ſpeaking of the *Bleſſedneſs of eating of Bread in the Kingdom of God*, Chriſt takes occaſion to ſhew forth the *Goſpel Supper* by a Parable, viz. *A Certain Man made a Great Supper, and bid many, but they refuſed, upon divers pretences, and came not; He ſent out a ſecond and third time to invite an inferiour ſort of Gueſts*, and they came to the Supper; that is, they received the *Goſpel*, which is the *Power of God to Salvation*, and the Evidence, as well as Means of It: Which

Chriſt

Christ in the 27th verse farther expresses, thus (viz.) *And whosoever doth not bear my Cross and follow me cannot be my Disciple.* Now the Cross of Christ, the same Apostle also says, is the Power of God, 1 *Cor.* 1. 18. all which referrs to an *Inward* and Spiritual Work, and Supper, and that they who receive Christ in Spirit, *Sup with him in Spirit*, being the partakers of his Spiritual Supper, which Christ promises, and *prepares* for all those that open *at his knocks* the Door of their Hearts unto him, *Rev.* 3.

7thly. But besides what I have said, both from Scripture, and the Nature of the thing, in Proof of Christ's *Spiritual Supper*, and Defence of our *disuse* of the *visible Sign*, the Bishop himself does *the same* thing in relation to another Ordinance: For our Lord Jesus Christ did as solemnly Command his Disciples to *wash one another's Feet*, as to eat the Supper. The Passage is large and edifying, and I must recommend it to my Reader to peruse in his Bible, *John* 13. But that part of it which more strictly concerns this point, between the Bishop and me, I shall repeat here, verse 12, 13, 14, 15. *So after he had washed their Feet, and taken his Garments and was set down again; He said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me* Master and Lord; *and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your Feet,* ye also ought

ought to wash one anothers Feet! *For I have given you an Example that* ye should do as I have done to you. Thus Christ Commanded his Disciples, not only by his Authority but Example. Now does the Bishop and his Friends follow Christ's Example, and obey this Precept? He and they know they do not. What must I Inferr from thence, that the Bishop is no Christian? I suppose he would take it very ill from me. Tho' he has treated me and my Friends after that sort. But I will shew him a better example, and suppose he thinks, that if Christian Ministers and People, walk *Humbly* towards God and one with another, they fulfil this Commandment, tho' they disuse the Sign, by which the Lord Jesus expreſt and recommended *Humility* to his Followers: Now that which excuses the Bishop in reference to this Ordinance of *Washing of Feet*, will also excuse our disuse of the Supper, *viz. Our eating of the Spiritual Bread* and *Wine* of the Kingdom; the Thing Signified by the Outward Supper. But it is an Error incident to frail Man, to prefer the Practice of those things that have a Shew of Religion, and have *least* of Uneasiness, and of the Nature of the *Cross of Christ* in their Performance. Just thus it is easier to receive the Supper than to be *Humble*, if not easier than to wash Feet: For one is but a Memorial of Christ, but the other perhaps is a Reproach

proach of preſent Practice, and to be ſure a Command to *Mortification* and *Self-denial*, the hardeſt Leſſon in Religion. And who knows but for that Reaſon it has been *drop'd* ſo long; ſince it muſt be very uneaſie for People to continue a Cuſtom, to which their Daily Practice is ſo viſible a Contradiction: Though I hear the *Roman* Biſhop mocks the Text Once a Year.

8*thly*. But in Relation to the Supper, we farther ſay, the Practice is varied: Then they *Sat*, now one ſort *Stands*, another *Walks*, a third *Kneels*, a fourth *Lies down* upon the Ground, as in the Eaſt Countries. The *Romans* have one Opinion, the *Greeks* another, and the *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts* Divide, to great Bitterneſs, in their Sentiments about It.

9*thly*. Again, in thoſe Days there were *Diſciples*, ſuch as followed Chriſt, now *all* are admitted that profeſs Chriſtianity, tho' they do not follow him, or forſake any thing for his Name ſake, or keep any of his Holy Precepts, *Mat*. 5, 6, 7 Chapters.

10*thly*. Nor is this all we have to ſay to Juſtifie our *Diſuſe* of this Practice: It is *too much Look'd at, and Relied upon* by the People: And indeed is become a kind of Proteſtant *Extream Unction*; for if the Generality of them can but have it adminiſtred juſt before they Die, they are too apt to preſume upon it for an acceptance in the other World. And indeed

it

it is very frequent, if not natural, for many Men to excuſe their Diſobedience by *Sacrifice*; and where Ceremonies or Shadowy Services are continued, People reſt upon obſervance of them, and *Indulge* themſelves in the Neglect of the Doctrine of the *Croſs* of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. I need not look far, nor yet the Biſhop, for a proof of what I ſay; we can hardly miſs, which way ſo ever we throw our Eyes, the more is the pity: Aud as this is no ſmall Abuſe of Primitive Practice, ſo no ſmall Argument for our diſuſe of it. For when the *Brazen Serpent* was *over-ruled* by the Jews, God, that had commanded It, for their benefit, ſtirred up *Hezekiah* to Deſtroy it.

11*thly*. Beſides, theſe things are become matter of *Gain*, and made a *Sacerdotal Revenue*, not to ſay *Merchandize*; which has alſo help'd to *Scandalize* People of Tender Conſciencs, who think it a *Prophanation* of Religion to ſuffer any part of it to be *Exciſed* to the People that ought to be *Free*.

12*thly*. But paſſing that by at preſent, and ſuppoſing *Water Baptiſm* and the *Supper* were not Antiquated, but ſtill in Force, Who is there Qualified to Admiſter them? Who has received a *Commiſſion*, or the *Mind* of the Holy Ghoſt, and Power from on High to perform theſe things? For if thoſe that hold they are in Force, have *no* Divine Force or

Autho-

Authority to qualifie them to Administer them, there will be but a *Lifeless Imitation*, instead of an *Edifying Reality*. Which leads me to what I promised long since, That I would at the Close of this Discourse say something of the *True Ground* of our *Difference* and *Dissent*.

I say then, that where we are supposed to differ most, we differ *least*; and where we are believed to differ least, we *most of all* differ: Which I explain thus. It's generally thought, that we do not hold the Common Doctrines of Christianity, but have Introduced *New* and *Erroneous* Ones in lieu thereof: Whereas we plainly and entirely Believe the *Truths contained in the Creed* that is commonly called the *Apostles*; which is very Comprehensive as well as Ancient. But that which hath affected our Minds most, and engaged us in this Separation, was the great *Carnality* and *Emptiness* both of Ministers and People, under their Profession of Religion: They *having hardly the Form of Godliness*, but generally speaking, *denying the Power thereof; from whom*, the Scripture warns Believers *to turn away*.

Next Ministers being made such, and preaching, and the People worshipping *without the Spirit*, confining the Operations of it, to the *First* or *Apostolical* Times, as if these did not want them *as much*; or that Christ would be

less Propitious, where his Gifts were not less needful. I say, an *Humane* and *Lifeless* Ministry and Worship, together with the great Worldliness of Professors, have occasioned our Separation; and the Persecution that has commonly followed it, hath abundantly confirmed our Judgment in that Matter. Hence it was we Retired our selves to wait upon God together, according to the Gift of his Holy Spirit, and as the Apostle *Paul* exhorted the *Athenians*, Acts 17. *We felt after him* (with our Souls) *if by any means we might find him, and hear what God the Lord would say unto us; who speaks Peace unto his People and his Saints, but let them never turn to folly any more.* We could not, I say, tell how to think that such as God had never sent, but run *of themselves*, and were made Ministers by *Humane Learning* and *Authority*, not knowing the Work of the Spirit to their *own Regeneration*, could possibly Profit or Edifie the People *unto* their *Regeneration*: And yet that is the very *Work* and *End* of the true Gospel Ministry; for no Man can guide another in the way he never trod.

Besides, we apprehended the Ministry was very much a *Temporal Preferment*, and therefore few were to be found among them, that did not court the *Better Places*, I mean those that gave the *Greatest Pay*; and by those Methods mounted to *Worldly* Wealth and Honour,

nour, as the reſt of the World did: Turning *Alms* into **Dues**, and by Law, making Gifts **Rents**; and vexing thoſe extreamly, that for Conſcience ſake could not uphold them: Which we thought very Foreign to a Primitive and an Apoſtolical Spirit; and ſhort of a *True* and *Through Reformation*. This is not ſaid with any diſreſpect to their Perſons, or yet *Calling*, ſimply Conſidered; *for he that deſires the Office of a Biſhop, certainly deſires a good thing*; but the Holy Ghoſt in thoſe days, had the *Making* of them; and the good thing then was their *Service*, and not *Revenue* or *Worldly Dignity*. They were then not only *no Lords* (one being their Lord) *but they lorded it not over God's Clergy* or *Heritage*, which was the *People* in thoſe days, for ſo the word Κλήρων ſignifies, tho' it is now aſcribed *only* to the Miniſtry. Then the Ground of Propheſie, or Miniſtry, was the *Revelation* of the Spirit, in thoſe ancient Aſſemblies, as may be read 1 *Cor.* 14. 29, 30, 31, 32. For *all might Prophecy*, that is, *Preach* as the Spirit of God moved upon their Spirit, and gave them utterance, be it to Reproof, Inſtruction, or Conſolation: Now *Study*, *Collection* and *Memory*. In thoſe Days they Preach'd their *Own Experience* of the Work of God upon their Hearts, but moſt now Preach of the Experiences of *Others*, recorded in Scriptures, but according to their own and others *Humane Apprehenſions*. To be

brief, we Ground our *Conviction*, *Converſion*, *Miniſtry*, *Prayer*, and *Praiſe* upon the Light and Spirit of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as the Powerful and Effectual *Spring* of our Religious Performances, and that alone which prepares the Soul, and Enables it to Perform thoſe reſpective Services and Duties in a Manner *Acceptable* to God. And that Miniſtry and Worſhip which ſtands *not* in the Spirit, and is not performed in the Preparation and Inſpiration thereof, but according to the *Compilings*, *Traditions* and *Precepts* of Men, we cannot allow to be *Primitive* and *Evangelical*, and conſequently cannot join in them. And we are ſatisfied that it is the good Pleaſure of God, that all who profeſs the Name of his Dear, and Only Begotten, and Well-beloved Son, ſhould *Acquaint* themſelves with the Spirit of His Son in their own Hearts, in its *Reproof*, *Inſtruction*, *Conviction*, and *Conſolation*, that they may become *Spiritually Minded*, ſuch as mind Spiritual Things more than Earthly Ones; and that Daily *ſow to the Spirit*; that is, bring forth the Fruits of the Spirit, and become the Children of God, who are led by the Spirit of God. *Now the Fruit of the Spirit* is *Love*, *Joy*, *Peace*, *Long-ſuffering*, *Gentleneſs*, *Goodneſs*, *Faith*, *Meekneſs*, *Temperance*: *Againſt ſuch there is no Law*. *And they that are Chriſt's, have Crucified the Fleſh, with the Affections and Luſts thereof. But the Works of the Fleſh are manifeſt*

which

which are these, Adultery, Fornication, Uncleanness, Lasciviousness, Idolatry, Witchcraft, Hatred, Variance, Emulations, Wrath, Strife, Seditions, Heresies, Envyings, Murder, Drunkenness, Revilings, and such like: Of which I told you before, as also in time past, that they which do such things shall not Inherit the Kingdom of God, Rom. 8. 6, 14. Gal. 5. 16, to 24. Chap. 6. 7, 8. And under these *Marks*, and *Directions* all People may examine themselves, and know their *Birth*, *Family* and *Inheritance*, whether they are the off-spring of God, and true Christians, or Children of the Evil One: Those that are *born of the Spirit*, for whom is reserved an Inheritance with the *Saints in Light*, or the *Seed* of *Evil Doers*, for whom is reserved the *Blackness of Darkness* for ever. And truly it seems just with God, that those who love Darkness better than Light in this World, should have their *Fill* of It in the next; from which, God Almighty redeem Thee, Reader, that thou mayst walk in his blessed Light, *as he is in the Light, then thou wilt have fellowship with the Children of Light, and the Blood of Jesus Christ (the Great* Atonement) *shall Cleanse thee from all Sin,* 1 John 1. 5, 6, 7. yea, *from the filthiness both of Flesh and Spirit*; and being sanctified *throughout in Body* and *Spirit*, thou mayst live to serve God in the *Newness of his Holy Spirit*, Rom. 7. 6.

and come to be made a *New Man*; that is, an *other Man*. From a Proud, an *Humble* Man; from a Paſſionate, a *Patient* Man; from a Rough, a *Meek* Man; and of a Cruel, Covetous, Unjuſt, Laſcivious, Intemperate, Vain and Ungodly Man; thou becomeſt a *Merciful*, *Liberal*, *Juſt*, *Chaſt*, *Sober* and *Godly* Man: And where this Change, this New Birth, or New Creature is not known, Sacrifices avail nothing, Religion is but *Formality*, and the Peace of God will never be their Recompence of Reward, But they that walk after this bleſſed unerring Rule of the *New Creature*, *Peace* be on them, and *Mercy*, and upon the *Iſrael of God*, Gal. 6. 15, 16. who are the Circumciſion made *Without Hands*, *in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Fleſh*, *by the Circumciſion of Chriſt*, Col. 3. 11. even that of *the Heart*, *in the Spirit*, whoſe Praiſe is not of Men but of God, *Rom.* 2. 29. And who therefore Worſhip God in the Spirit, and have no Confidence in the Fleſh, *Phil.* 3. 3. that is, in fleſhly Ordinances, or the obſervation of *Figures* and *Signs* compounded of *Outward Elements*, which repreſent Heavenly Things: Wherefore the Apoſtle Exhorted and Commanded, *Col.* 2. 16, 17. *Let no Man Judge you in* Meat or in Drink *or in reſpect of an* Holy Day, &c. *which are* Shadows *of things to Come*, *but the* Body is of Chriſt; that is, Chriſt is the *Subſtance* of all outward repre-

repreſentations, and they that have *Chriſt* have the *End* of all thoſe things: Whom Reader we Labour and Pray, may be better known, received and obeyed by the Profeſſors of his Holy Name and Religion. That as he is Given of God to be our Prieſt, Prophet and King, we may all *Know*, *Feel* and *Enjoy* him ſuch in our ſelves, and then the Kingdom of God will be come in us, and his Will done in our Earth as it is in Heaven: Which God Grant, I moſt Humbly beſeech him.

For the Concluſion of the Biſhop's Paper, it is either *Repetition*, or *Reflection*; the one needs no Anſwer, and the other wants a Defence. However, I will not have it ſaid that I either wave or ſuppreſs It, and therefore without any Reflection I will conſider his: Which ſhould have no weight with my Reader but againſt him.

He ſays in his 12th Paragraph, He *pities us*, thinking many of us *Harmleſs* and *Well-meaning*, *but under the Power of ſtrong Deluſions*. And in his 13th Paragraph he gives us his ſenſe of the cauſe thereof, viz. *that we make the Light within, a Rule of Faith and Practice, Co-ordinate, if not Superiour and Antecedent to the Holy Scripture.* To prove which to be our Sentiment, he cites theſe words out of our *Goſpel-Truths*, where ſpeaking of the Holy Spirit, and the Scriptures, we ſay, *they are the Double and Agreeing Record of true Religion.*

gion. Now if the Light and Spirit agree with the Scripture, there is no fear of contradicting the Scripture, and so we can have nothing to answer for on account of that Expression, for what agrees with the Scripture, *establishes* it, instead of Slighting or Superceeding the Authority of it.

And though we used no such words as *Co-ordinate*, much less *Superiour* and *Antecedent*, which is the Bishop's Gloss to render our most True and In-offensive Expression suspected, and make way to fasten his supposed *Strong Delusions* upon us; I will be very frank with him in this matter, that we Believe the Scripture to be the Declaration of the Mind of the Holy Ghost, and therefore not Superiour to the Holy Ghost, but *Credited*, *Confirmed*, and *Expounded* by the Holy Ghost; so that without the Illumination of It, the Scripture cannot be understood by them that read It. The Gramatical and Critical Sense of the Words, and Allusions therein may be understood, but the *Inside* and Spiritual Signification of them, is a Riddle to those that are not Spiritually Instructed therein, tho' they were never such Gramarians or Linguists.

Again Christ says, *He that loves the Light brings his Deeds to the Light, to see if they are wrought in God*, John 3. 21. which was before the New Testament Scripture was in being;

ing; and this makes It both *Rule* and *Judge* of the Life and Deeds of Men. What says the Bishop to this? Also *John* 14, 15, 16 Chapters, Christ promises the *Spirit to lead them*, his People, *into all Truth*, and this was not the Scripture, but something at least *Co-ordinate*, *if not Superiour and Antecedent to the Scripture*, which is more than we said before. Also the Apostle *Paul* tells the Romans, Ch. 8. that *as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God:* Then the Spirit is to Lead Believers, or they cannot be the Children of God. And that which Leads, Rules, and that which Rules is a *Rule* to them that follow it. And the same Apostle referr'd the *Galathians*, Chap. 6. 15, 16. to the Rule of the *New Creature* to walk by, and that must be the Spirit which begets the *New Creature*, viz. *Christ formed in them*, of whom he tells them, Chap. 4. 19. *He travelled in Birth again.* And the Beloved Disciple expresly says to the Christians, in his First Epistle, Chap. 2. 20. that they had an *Unction from the Holy One, and they knew* **all things**, that is, all things they had to Believe, Know and Practice. And verse 27. he adds, *But the Anointing which ye have received abideth in you, and ye need not that any Man teach you, but as the same Anointing teacheth you of* All things, *and is Truth.* If the Bishop will break through all these Scriptures to undervalue the Light

and

and Spirit of Christ (for no other Light or Spirit do we Assert, Recommend People to, or Contend for) that he might render us Guilty of *Strong Deluſions*, I cannot help it, but muſt be truly ſorry for him. But I beſeech him to have a care that he does not, like the Jews of old, Undervalue, and indeed *Blaſpheme* againſt the Holy Light and Spirit of God, and by miſcalling the Fruits and Effects of its Power, *Strong Deluſions and Tranſformations of Satan:* For God will not hold ſuch Guiltleſs in his Great and Terrible Day of Judgment.

And after all, the Beſt and Firſt Reformers and Martyrs, as well as Fathers, Concurr in our Aſſertion and Teſtimony. As *Zuinglius*, *Luther*, *Melanchton*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Bucer*, *Peter Martyr*, and *Eraſmus* too. Alſo our own Excellent Martyrs, *viz. Lambert*, *Rogers*, *Philpot*, *Bradford*, *Hooper*, *Woodman*, &c. that the *Double and Agreeing Teſtimony* of the *Spirit of God within, and the Scripture of Truth without, is the Rule and Judge of Faith, Doctrine and Practice*; yea, that the Spirit is given to Believers to be the *Rule and Judge* by which they are to underſtand the true Senſe and Meaning of the Scriptures. Now let the Reader judge who gives the Trueſt Honour to the Scripture, the Biſhop, or the People called Quakers? They ſay the Scriptures have a Double Record, that is, the Evidence of the

Spirit

Spirit of Truth in the Hearts of Believers, as well as their Own: Or the Bishop, who by his way of Treating us and our Principle, will allow us no other Evidence of their Truth, but Themselves. For to say the Evidence of the Spirit of God, with that of the Scripture, make a *Double* and *agreeing Testimony* is with him to undervalue the Scripture, and the Ground, in his Apprehension, of our Strong Delusions. It must be my turn now to pity the Bishop, and truly I do it with all my Heart, to see him *strain* so Sound, as well as *Inoffensive* an Expression, as that which he makes the Reason of our Delusion, that he might have an occasion to lessen our Credit with the Professors of Christianity, and especially Protestants. Can it Dishonour the Scripture to deny the Evidence of the Principal and Author of the Scripture, to back the Authority of the Scripture? Or doth not he rather lessen the Authority of Scripture, that will not allow us another Evidence of the Truth of Scripture than its own, for fear of *Co-ordinacy*, which was not so much as once intended to be insinuated by us, nor do the words import any such thing; yet it had been no strong, nor any *Delusion at all* to give the Holy Ghost the Preference. But I shall keep to the Terms of the Paper, whatever the Bishop is pleased to do; knowing that whoever Concludes an Argument in

terms

terms not in the Queſtion, nor plainly deduceable from the Premiſes, is not a *fair Dealer* in Controverſie: In which the Biſhop, if he pleaſes, may reaſonably enough think himſelf more than once concerned.

Bleſſed be God we have known the Power and Efficiency of this Holy Light and Spirit of Chriſt in our ſelves, and being in good meaſure Witneſſes thereof, we do not only ſpeak by Report, but by Experience. We had the Scriptures in the Days of our Ignorance and Worldly-mindedneſs, but diſregarding the Reproofs and Inſtruction of the Light of Jeſus in our Hearts, we never could come to know the Power of thoſe Truths the Scripture declares of. But when it pleaſed God, in the Riches of his Love, to cauſe his bleſſed Light, that had ſhined in Darkneſs, and the Darkneſs comprehended it not, *to ſhine out of Darkneſs*, and *gives us the Knowledge of himſelf in the Face* (or through the Manifeſtation) of his Son Jeſus Chriſt, we ſaw and bewailed our ſelves, and by an unfeigned Sorrow and Repentance, returned as Penitent Prodigals towards our Father's Houſe; and in this Turn, we were brought to die daily to that Love and Satisfaction we once had in the Glory, Pleaſures, Honours, Frindſhips and Diverſions of the World, which now became *Burdenſome*, more than ever they were pleaſing to us.

Hence

Hence it was, and from no Sinister Ends or Self-righteous Conceits, that we became an altered and a distinguished People, in our Behaviour, Garb and Conversation: More *Retired*, *Watchful*, *Silent* and *Plain* than formerly; equally avoiding *Luxury* and *Avarice*. I say, it was the Work of God's Spirit upon our Hearts, who by his Light gave us to see the just difference of things, and to distinguish between that which pleased Him, and that which pleased Him not. And this Holy Pattern he gave us in the Light of his beloved Son, which we design to follow, as did the Holy Ancients; and is a full answer to the Bishop's Unfriendly Queries upon our distinguishing Behaviour, in his 14th and 15th Paragraph, as if it were not out of Fear towards God, or upon a Conscientious Bottom, but to serve a worldly Turn? For he asks us, *Is it not your* main Aim, End and Study, by pretended *Mortifications*, *to make your selves a Party Considerable?* Again, *Are not to this Purpose your different Garb*, *Speech*, *Looks and Gestures*, *and to make your selves remarkable*, *rather than out of a Sense of Duty*, *or Conscience of Obligation?* Which, as it is the worst Construction that the most Irreligious and Prophane could make upon our Behaviour, so I beseech God to forgive the Bishop, and make him sensible how little such Treatment of strict and sober Living advances the Common Cause of Religion

ligion, and how much it indulges those that know no Reins or Check to their Excesses in his own Church. But to go no farther than the Bishop and his *Clergy*, pray who distinguish themselves more by their Garb from other People than they? Tho' I cannot say as much of their Behaviour. So indeed did the *Chemerims* or black Coats of old, and Those that wore long Robes in our Saviour's time, but as I take it, they went not without his Censure, while I think the Bishop will find none in Scripture against our Plainness. But the Bishops Pontifical Robes, do in my Opinion look much more like *Singularity* and a *Sight* than ours; for our Garb is like other Mens, only freed of their Superfluity. In short I wish him a better Understanding of the true Grounds of our stricter Conduct, and Where and Who they are that make a **Trade** of Religion; that if he has any Shot left against *Mercinary* Religionists, he may not miss the Mark next time, but may make it his *main Aim*, *End* and *Study*, to Expose Hirelings and Hypocrites in their Proper Colours: And some are of Opinion he need not go far to find too many of them.

It is strange the Bishop should be so unsensible of the Advantage he gives me by his *Queries*, and what a wide Door he opens to a Severe Retaliation; but I desire to be

Modest,

Modeſt, and to be Silent upon ſuch Advantages, is, I think, to be abundantly ſo.

Howbeit, I muſt take Notice of one Expreſſion, for it may too ſeriouſly affect us not to be obſerved to him. When he asks, *If it be not our main End and Study, by pretended Mortifications, to make our ſelves a Party Conſiderable?* He adds, *and ſuch to which,* **for Reaſons of State**, *Peculiar Priviledges muſt be indulged.* If this were not more than Mockery, I ſhould wave my Notice; but calling the meaning of the Government in Queſtion about the *Liberty of Conſcience* we enjoy, He muſt forgive me if I beſtow a few Remarks upon that Expreſſion. It ſeems then our Liberty flows not from the Inclination of the Government to Liberty, leſs from Compaſſion, and leaſt of all from Juſtice and a Chriſtian Principle. Which Motives carry with them a Proſpect of the Continuance of Liberty, if not for Liberty's ſake. But the Biſhop believes no ſuch thing, and if he would not have us of his mind, he did weakly to tell us ſo. Well then, we are all of us to take his Advertiſement, that our Liberty hangs but by ſlender Threads, and a *Reaſon of State*, and not of Nature, Right or Chriſtianity; which certainly is not to beſpeak this *Conſiderable Party* to the advantage of the Government: And for which I think the Biſhop a very moderate Statesman, and the Government as little beholding

to

to his *Politicks* as we are to his *Charity*. However, we will have a better Opinion of our Superiours Regard to Liberty, and conclude that their Inclination equals their Discretion, and that their Judgment as well as Prudence is of that side. Let the Bishop say what he pleases. And tho' he deserves it not at my Hands, I could almost perswade my self to think that he does not begrudge us, and means not so loosly as he writes. But be it as it will, *That God that has upheld us by his free Spirit to this Day, through many and great Afflictions, we firmly believe will suffer nothing to attend us, that shall not in the Conclusion work for his Glory and our Good, if we continue stedfast to the End, in the blessed Way of Righteousness, wherein he has so often and signally Owned and Preserved us; notwithstanding the Violence of Open Enemies, and the Treacherous and Restless Endeavours of False Friends.*

His 16th Paragraph multiplies Reflection, as before observed, and Repeats what I have already largly answered; particularly that we own the Christian Faith, which he makes us to *Wave*, *Suppress*, or at least not to Confess; and have express'd it even in the Paper, he has faulted so much of Shortness, and that more fully, in all Points, than in the Creed commonly called the *Athenasian*; except that about the *Trinity*, which seems to me less plain by that Copious way taken to explain It.

But

He also says, *We Reject all Outward, Positive Parts of Worship*, which we deny: For we own and use *Prayer*, *Preaching* and *Praising in the Spirit*, without which they cannot be Owned or Joyned with; for they cannot be so performed to Edification by a true Christian Worshipper; since God, *who is a Spirit, will be Worshipped in Spirit, and in Truth*, which Christ's Spirit must enable us to perform: And such Worshippers Only, God the Father seeks to Worship him: Implying he regards not other Worshippers.

But *Especially*, the Bishop says, *we reject Baptism and the Supper*. We say, we do not *Reject* but *Disuse* the Signs, because we felt the *Invisible Graces* in *our Souls* they were *Signs* and *Shadows* of; and therefore not in *Disrespect* to the Signs, but in *Reverence* to the Divine Substance they shew forth, we discontinue their use among us. They obtain'd place in the *Infancy* and *Twi-light* of the Church; in her more weak and Ceremonious time, directing, as I may say, that *Inter-regnum* between the Law and the Gospel, before the Dispensation of the Holy Ghost had *Fully* obtained Place and Preheminence in the Church. But of this I have been already very particular.

He grows *warm* in his 17th Paragraph and *Episcopal*; for he says, *In a word, I again* Require you, *as you will answer all your* Secret Arts and Pretensions *at Christ's Tribunal*, that

you either Embrace and Profeſs the Entire Chriſtian Truth, *in the Points wherein I have ſhewn you to be Defective*; *and that you receive the Chriſtian* Seals or Badges, Baptiſm *and the* Lord's Supper; *or elſe that you* Deſiſt *to lay claim to the Name of Chriſtians.*

But firſt I muſt return the Biſhop *his Secret Arts and Pretenſions*, In all which, he is Grievouſly Miſtaken. For either I do not underſtand his meaning, or I abhor it. Next, be it known to him, we *Wave not*, we *Suppreſs not*, but heartily Embrace and Profeſs before the whole World, all Points of Chriſtian Doctrine, according to the mind of the Holy Ghoſt, as I have amply ſignified before upon this Subject: And where the Biſhop takes leave of the Text, he muſt excuſe me if I leave him to keep company with it. We did not Entitle our Paper *All Goſpel-Truths*; but *Goſpel-Truths*, which extended ſo far as we were Tax'd with Error about thoſe Truths: And yet he muſt have but a little Charity that will not allow a Believer and Follower of thoſe Truths to be a Chriſtian. Nor indeed has the Biſhop given us the Articles of Faith he ſays we *Wave* or *Suppreſs*, or told us his own, or that *One Church*'s Faith he would have us receive, as I have complained already. But that the Biſhop *ſhould forbid us ſo much as to lay claim to the Name of* Chriſtians, *unleſs we will Practice what he calls the* Seal

or

or Badges *of Christianity* (which divers Churches in *Christendom* think he misuses) is very Uncharitable and Dogmatical. But besides what I have said at large in our Excuse and Defence in that Matter, he produces not one Scripture that calls them either *Seals* or *Badges*. But yet there are other things that are so represented by our blessed Saviour and his Apostles, which he takes no notice of. As *Mat.* 16. 24. where, *they that will be reputed Christ's Disciples must take up his Cross and follow him.* Christ's *Cross* is a Christian's *Badge* and *Seal* of Discipleship. Again, *John* 13. 35. He said to his Disciples, *By this shall all Men know that ye are my Disciples, if ye love one another.* Likewise *Mat.* 25. 34, 35, 36. The Distinguishing Character of the last Day is not Water Baptism and the Outward Supper, but *Love*, *Mercy* and *Compassion*; *Bowels* and *Charity*; not being *Ashamed* or *Afraid* of Owning and Helping the Lord's Servants in their Afflictions, viz. *I was an Hungry, and ye gave Me Meat: I was Thirsty and ye gave me Drink: I was a Stranger and ye took Me in: Naked and ye Cloathed Me: I was Sick and ye visited Me: I was in Prison and ye came unto Me.* This is the Christian Badge that will be Recognized by our Lord Jesus Christ at the last day: We have his own Word for it. In all which, He is so far from mentioning either of the other Badges

that, *Luke* 13. He brings in the *Unhappy*, that are on his left hand, using this Argument to engage him to receive them into blessedness, viz. *We have* **Eaten** *and* **Drank** *in thy Presence, and thou hast taught in our Streets.* A plain Instance they had the use of such Ordinances as the Bishop reputes *Badges* of Christianity; but it is as plain that such Pleas would not do: For behold the Lord Jesus says unto them in the Parable, *I know you not, depart from me ye workers of Iniquity!* I recommend the perusal of the following Verses to my Reader, which confirm my sense of the Text: For He spoke to an outside People that counted themselves the People of God, and were observers of *Meats* and *Drinks*, and *Divers Washings:* And that which was Doctrine and Caution then, is Doctrine and Caution now; for Truth holds the same to the End.

I might add, Holiness for a *Characteristick, without which no Man shall ever see the Lord:* and that *neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but a* New Creature, *Gal.* 6. Also the Fruits of the Spirit, *Chap.* 5. among which there is not one word about *Water-Baptism* or the *Outward Supper*, with many more Passages that are Close and Cogent.

His

His 18th and last Paragraph tells us, *He will not judge us*, and yet his whole Paper is but one Continued Judgment of us. But, *from God*, as he says, *and as his Minister he bids us Judge our selves.* First, We thank God we are before hand with the Bishop, having Judged our selves, and that by the Judgment of God upon us, and so have right to Judge others according to that Judgment. Secondly, We have no proof that the Bishop speaks from God to us: Nor can I tell how he should, that does not acknowledge the Inspeaking Word of God in the Soul. Thirdly, For his being God's Minister, he has not shewn us his Commission yet, and I fear it will not be from Heaven when ever he does. But if my Reader will take the pains of perusing this very Paragraph, he will not only see a Judging Spirit, but that the Bishop holds out abusing of us to the last, rendring us as bad as bad can be, *viz.* That we *Subvert the Faith once delivered to the Saints, and equal our Conceits to the Divine Oracles, Using and Disusing what Parts of God's Instituted Worship we please*; adding, *I will not Interpose your making* Gain *your* Godliness. But as I have already taken ample notice of this Charge, so I shall say no more of his Irreligious *Slant* at our Sincerity than this, That I cannot pretend to tell the Bishop what Tribe of Men in *Christendom* it is that have long made

Gain

Gain their Godlineſs, and the Pretence of it their Worldly Inheritance; ſince he has been ſo much more Senſibly Inſtructed in this Affair than my ſelf: But one thing I am ſure of, that if *Gain* and not *Godlineſs* was our Motive to be the People we are, we mightily Miſtook our way *when we left the Biſhops:* For *Afflictions*, *Spoiles*, *Priſons*, *Baniſhments*, yea, and *Death* it ſelf have attended us ſince God was pleaſed to manifeſt his Truth to us: And if under all thoſe Calamities that have followed us ſince we were a People, for the ſake of our Unfaſhionable Profeſſion, the Biſhop or any elſe is ſo Unnatural, as to envy us the Bleſſing of God upon our honeſt Induſtry, and to render that which is an Effect of God's Goodneſs, the Reaſon and End of our Religion, God forgive them. I could Enlarge upon this Topick, but time would fail, and the Diſcourſe ſwell beyond Bounds, as indeed it hath already beyond my Expectation; for which I ſhould Excuſe my ſelf to my Reader, but that it was not Simply from the Regard I had to the Biſhop's Sheet, ſince that could not have deſerved this Notice from me, but might have been anſwered as Conciſely as that was written, had I only conſidered his Undertaking and Treatment, and not my Readers Satisfaction, in the better Knowledge of our ſo much Miſrepreſented Perſwaſion: Eſpecially in a Nation, where of late I had occaſion

ſo

ſo Generally to Travel, and the Biſhop's Paper hath been I ſuppoſe as Generally Diſper'd. I owe it therefore to My Profeſſion, to My Self, and to the Country, to Vindicate the One, and to Expreſs my Chriſtian Regard and Acknowledgement to the Other; having received a more than common Civility from the Inhabitants in General: To whom I wiſh, as to my own Soul, the Saving Knowledge of the Truth, as it is in Jeſus: That Chriſtians *Indeed* and *at Heart* They may be, to the Glory of God their Creator, and the Eternal Salvation of their Souls, through Jeſus Chriſt, the alone Redeemer, and to whom with the Father, by the Holy Ghoſt, be all Honour and Glory, Thankſgiving and Praiſe, World without End.

FINIS.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
289.6P38D C001
A DEFENCE OF A PAPER LOND
3 0112 025279313